

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF POWER IN THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF
CHANGES IN A NEW TEACHER MENTORING PROGRAM: A CASE STUDY

A Dissertation

by

PHYLLIS CAVANAUGH FERGUSON

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2007

Major Subject: Educational Administration

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF POWER IN THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF
CHANGES IN A NEW TEACHER MENTORING PROGRAM: A CASE STUDY

A Dissertation

by

PHYLLIS CAVANAUGH FERGUSON

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Co-Chairs of Committee,	Virginia Collier
	G. Patrick Slattery
Committee Members,	Elizabeth Foster
	Luana Zellner
Head of Department,	Jim Scheurich

August 2007

Major Subject: Educational Administration

ABSTRACT

A Critical Analysis of Power in the Institutionalization of Changes in a New

Teacher Mentoring Program: A Case Study. (August 2007)

Phyllis Cavanaugh Ferguson, B.A., Louisiana State University at New Orleans;

M.Ed., University of New Orleans

Co-Chairs of Advisory Committee: Dr. Virginia Collier
Dr. G. Patrick Slattery

The purpose of this case study is to describe the way power, as individual agency, works in the space of institutionalization of a new teacher mentoring program. The space of institutionalization is thought of as a space in which the design of the mentoring program and the actions of participants interact as the program undergoes changes.

The participants in this study tell about the way each goes about mentoring in response to the program changes. Their stories are analyzed through critical discourse analysis for workings of power. Two kinds of power or agency emerge through the analysis. Instrumental agency is the physical activities, perceptions, and spoken words of the mentors limited by their subject and structural positionality. Instrumental agency in the space of institutionalization worked to instill differentiation as plurality and normalization as objectification into the mentoring program. When instrumental agency is the dominant power in the space of institutionalization, the legitimacy of the mentoring program is rationalized as legitimization. Legitimization of the program results in an ecology of the space of institutionalization open to vagaries of political expediency.

The second kind of power or agency to emerge is operative agency. Operative agency originates in sensings and feelings as expressed in wondering and uncertainty about mentoring roles and the mentoring program. When engaging operative agency as power, differentiation and normalization in the space of institutionalization can be questioned.

DEDICATION

To Bill, Sean, and Robin, my family

And

Dr. Albert Cavanaugh and Mrs. Ruth Cavanaugh, my parents

And

Mr. Arnold Ferguson and Dr. Frances Ferguson, my in-laws

Each a mentor to others

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to the many who supported me while I worked on this project. I want to thank my family. My husband Bill was always patient with the time that I needed and always turned the television down when I asked. His love and understanding made this study possible. Sean, our son, reminded me to write simply because some masters student may read it. He spoke from experience as he was getting his masters degree and reading research as I was writing. I hope I've heeded his advice. Robin, our daughter-in-law, and I empathized with each other because she too was in a masters program. My mother-in-law, Dr. Frances Ferguson, listened, read, and made suggestions throughout the process. She had already been down this road.

Thanks also go to my friends Scot and Gail. Gail listened to my tales of progress as we walked and drank coffee every Tuesday and Thursday. Both of them reminded me to balance the work with play. My friends Kathy and Diane, fellow travelers on the road, celebrated and commiserated with me as only other doctoral students can.

Thanks to my committee. Dr. Virginia Collier kept me on track throughout the process. Dr. Patrick Slattery always had a suggestion or question that pointed me toward other research that nourished my mind. Both of them guided and encouraged, but in their wisdom, let me find my own way. Dr. Elizabeth Foster introduced me to the world of new teacher mentoring. I am thankful that she did. She is dedicated to the future of education. Dr. Luana Zellner always offered gentle but meaningful observations about my work. To each of you, I am grateful.

Thanks to the superintendent and board of Rio Public Schools for letting me into the district. Linda, the district director, is a true professional wanting the best for the new teachers. Amanda and Kerry both gave me valuable insight into their work as mentors. They all have passion for their work. Thank you to Ilsa, the principal of Lundgren Elementary School, for allowing me access to her, Kerry, and her building.

Thanks, lastly, to all those involved with the work of mentoring new teachers. May we all remember the democratic ideals of equality and justice as we bring those that are new into the folds of our profession.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Significance of the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose of the Study	5
Research Questions	7
Operational Definitions	7
Overview of the Study	13
II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	14
Power	14
Sources of power: The position power link	14
The position power link: Reproduction and resistance	15
An example: Mentoring from a Marxist feminine perspective	21
Relationships of power: Foucault's conception of power	23
An example: Mentoring in relationship with self, others, and schools	30
Feminism and power: Identities, bodies, and place	33
An example: The power of difference	35
The space of power: Bodies and movement	39
The power of reconfiguration: Cyborgs	41
The power of standards: Location and identity	45

CHAPTER	Page
Mentoring in Schools	47
The purpose of mentoring	48
An example: Mentors as “local guides”	50
Mentors as “educational companions:” Programs of support and development	51
Adult developmental theory	53
An example: Support and challenge and cognitive development	54
Another example: Phases of concern	55
Mentoring programs and power	56
Institutionalization.....	57
Change in the process of institutionalization	57
Institutionalization: Phases of change	58
Institutionalization: A procedural model	61
The noticeable absence of the presence of power	65
Power, mentoring, and the institutionalization of change: The braid of analysis.....	68
III METHODOLOGY	70
The Definition of a Case Study	70
Participants and Site Selection	71
Data Collection.....	73
Rationale for Choosing Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis.....	74
Text Analysis.....	78
Data Representation	80
Trustworthiness	81
Limitations to Trustworthiness.....	82
IV DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS	83
The Space of Institutionalization	83
Agency	83
Positionality.....	84
Legitimacy.....	86

CHAPTER	Page
Surveillance.....	95
Structure as surveillance	95
Training as surveillance	99
Staffing as surveillance	101
A Monthly District Mentor Meeting	104
October 30 notes on mentor meeting at Rio Public Schools	104
Positionality.....	109
Self-positioning: Amanda	109
Self-positioning: Kerry.....	111
Positioning of Others: Differentiation.....	114
How Amanda positions Kerry	115
How Kerry positions Amanda.....	116
Agency	121
The campus mentor acts: Kerry	121
A Campus Mentor New Teacher Training.....	126
October 2 observation script of new teacher training by Kerry.....	127
Agency Continued.....	129
The district mentor acts: Amanda	129
Operative Agency: Beyond Action, Words, and Perception.....	135
Uncertainty about mentoring roles.....	136
Ambiguity about difference	138
Uncertainty about legitimacy	142
 V CONCLUSIONS, STUDY LIMITATIONS, QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY, AND IMPLICATIONS OF THIS STUDY ON FUTURE RESEARCH	 146
Instrumental Agency	147
Non-consciousness	147
Differentiation in the space of institutionalization: Pluralism.....	149
Normalization in the space of institutionalization: Objectification.....	152
Authoritative Power	155
Summary	158
Operative Agency.....	159
De-objectifying normalization	162
Deconstructing plurality.....	163
Questioning legitimization	164

CHAPTER	Page
Study Limitations and Questions for Further Study.....	165
Implications of This Study on Future Research	166
How do school district leaders and others in institutionalization projects recognize normalization as objectification and differentiation as pluralism?	166
What happens to the processes of change as power enters the space of institutionalization?	168
How do school district leaders recognize and respond to the wonderings and uncertainties of participants as operative agency in an institutionalization project?	169
What happens to mentoring programs that encompass descriptions of phases, procedures, and the workings of power in the space of institutionalization?	170
REFERENCES	171
VITA	180

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Significance of the Study

The need to attract new teachers and reduce teacher attrition is being met in America's public schools by the use of new teacher induction or mentoring programs (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; U.S. Department of Education Office of Post Secondary Education, 2005; American Federation of Teachers, September 1, 2001). Studies that consider and describe the relationship between the mentor and mentee (Bullough, 2005; Colley, 2002; Marsh, 2002) and the identity, roles, and function of the mentor (Bullough, 2005; Elliott & Calderhead, 1995; Odell & Huling, 2000; Roberts, 2000) have added to the knowledge about mentoring. However, less is known about the programmatic issues of mentoring.

Ingersoll & Kralik (2004) studied the effect of induction or mentoring programs on teacher retention. They located ten comparison studies that also fit their requirements of quantitative data and program evaluation. They concluded that "collectively the studies do provide empirical support for the claim that assistance for new teachers and, in particular, mentoring programs have a positive impact on teachers and their retention" (p. 1). However, they also emphasized the lack of controlled studies about such issues as

This dissertation follows the style of *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*.

mentoring program design, implementation, and impact on student achievement. Besides the emphasis on controlled studies, Ingersoll and Kralik show the need for studies about programmatic issues.

Ehrich, Hansford, & Tennent (2004) reviewed 159 studies about mentoring in education. They found that more studies reported benefits of mentoring programs for the mentee than for the mentors. They also found that in looking for negative impacts of mentoring, more studies found that problems in mentoring were concerned with the mentors than with the mentees. A third component of their study looked at the way mentoring programs affected the school organization. More studies reported positive outcomes for the schools. Of the few that reported negative, programmatic issues of financial support and commitment were cited. They conclude “that mentoring is a highly complex, dynamic, and interpersonal relationship that requires ... time, interest, and commitment of mentors and mentees and strong support from educational ... leaders responsible for overseeing the program” (p. 533).

Ehrich, Hansford, and Tennent (2004) propose four challenges for administrators as they consider mentoring programs for their school organizations. They are: awareness of the range of mentoring programs, financial and personnel support, choice of and training for mentors, choice of mentees, and evaluation of the program. They connect the necessity of leadership awareness and support to the benefits of mentoring.

Neither of these studies framed the problems of mentoring or the programmatic questions for further study as issues of power. That was not their purpose. The strength of both studies (Ehrich, Hansford, & Tennent, 2004; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004) is the stress

they give to the broader area of program issues of mentoring in understanding the efficacy of mentoring programs. Their studies bring attention to the program practices of mentoring. This case study carries forward the attention to mentoring programs by connecting mentoring program issues to issues of power. This case study considers the workings of power involved in the program issue of establishing or institutionalizing a mentoring program. The problem of the study centers in describing how power operates in the institutionalization of a new teacher mentoring program.

Statement of the Problem

The origin of this problem is in the juxtaposition of three strands of knowledge. The first is knowledge about new teacher induction or mentoring. The efficacy of mentoring programs for teacher retention has been established (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, 2005). Recognition of the connection between teacher retention and mentoring has resulted in an increased number of states initiating induction or mentoring programs for new teachers (American Federation of Teachers, September, 2001; U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, 2005). Ingersoll & Kralik (2004) report that great variance exists among state programs as to purpose, duration, mentor qualification and training, nature of support, and new teacher eligibility. They also note that not much research has been done on comparison of programs to evaluate their effect on how teachers learn to teach and then connect what they do in the classroom with the learning of their students.

The second strand of knowledge concerns the processes connected with establishing a mentoring program in a school district. School districts in states without

mandated mentoring or induction programs or in states that do not have statutes on mentoring programs have many mentoring program options from which to choose. However, they have little guidance as to what works. In such a case, school districts often choose what is familiar or in fashion. The process of choice “[consists] of a complex interplay among organizational forces, political pressures, personal motivations, and educational concerns” (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978, p. 14). School districts in states with mandated and funded programs may have to reconcile mandated programs with local needs and resources.

The purpose of institutionalization is to bring into place a new program or changes in a program so that they become a practiced and accepted part of an organization (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Hall & Hord, 2001). The phases or stages of establishing a new program in a school district have been described. Knowing through description if the program is in a mobilization, implementation, or institutionalization phase gives the program directionality. It provides benchmarks for acknowledging progress. Description of the phases also makes it possible to assign work such as planning, implementing, and evaluating (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978). Procedures are ideas, tactics, and strategies assigned to different people for guiding the program into permanent existence in the school district. A program can only become an integral part of a school district if specific functions are carried out (Hall & Hord, 2001).

In bringing a mentoring program into a district or making changes in an existing program, the hope is that it becomes an accepted and regularly practiced part of the school district and all the schools. Knowledge about phases of program establishment and

the specifics of the work involved is important. However, there is more knowledge needed than just knowledge about phases, roles, functions, and responsibilities.

Therefore, the third strand is knowledge about power. People carry out the work of the phases of institutionalization (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978). People and the work they do and the concerns they have are the most important part of Hall and Hord's (2001) procedures. Power is inherent to the process when people work together on the institutionalization of an important program such as mentoring. The power may be covert and unidentified, but it is there nevertheless. The problem of this case study is about how power works in the institutionalization of a mentoring program. More specifically, the problem is about sources of power, the actions of power, and the results of power as people work together to establish changes in a new teacher mentoring program that will make it an accepted and practiced part of the school district.

Purpose of the Study

The first purpose of the case study is to describe, analyze, and interpret through a critical standpoint the presence of power in the establishment of changes in a new teacher mentoring program in Rio School district and particularly, Lundgren Elementary School. Power will be recognized through the description of the positionality and agency of the district director of the mentoring program, a district mentor, and a campus liaison/mentor as they do their work in the mentoring program. The second purpose of this case study is to reconceptualize institutionalization as a space in which power operates to both limit and create interactions among mentoring program participants and between the

participants and the program itself. The third purpose of the case study is to connect power to the broader issue of mentor program legitimacy.

By describing power, locating it in the space of institutionalization, and considering the connection of power to mentor program legitimacy, this case study adds to the knowledge of the construction of mentoring roles (Ellsworth, 1994; 2005; Ellsworth & Miller, 1996). Mentoring roles are seen as more than essential attributes (Anderson and Shannon, 1995) and phenomenological essences (Roberts, 2000). These are important to what mentoring is, but do not consider how power also is implicated in the construction of the roles. The addition of the critical analysis of power interrogates mentoring roles from the viewpoint of the agency of the participating mentors. For Foucault (1994), this is interpretation of power from those on the inside engaged with power as possible domination. But to analyze the agentic roles of the mentors critically, the inside view must be in relationship to those on the outside of the “action” who don’t or won’t see the implications of power. Without this relationship criticality is disregarded and the agentic roles of the mentors are only descriptive. Without the relationship of inside and outside, the inherent friction and rub of power cannot be analyzed. Kinchloe (Kinchloe, 1991, as cited in Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 2004) in his requirements for critical research ascribes being critical to the researcher’s use of the perspectives of those involved in the interpretation of their roles, i.e. mentoring roles. He also requires that criticality “must reject positivist notions of rationality, objectivity, and truth” (Kinchloe, 1991, p. x, as cited in Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 2004, p.57). However, in this case study, it is not the rejection of rationality and totalizing truth,

but instead it is putting the agentive roles of the mentors in a context or space of contestation with differing versions of truth. Within this space, the space of institutionalization, the issue of mentoring program purpose is connected to the agentive roles of the mentors (Ellsworth, 2005; Haraway, 1994; 2004; Star, 1991). Therefore, agentive mentoring roles as “local guides”, “educational companions”, or “agents of cultural change” (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1992, pp. 14-15) as part of the issue of program purpose can be critically analyzed. Through this study, the objective, political, and ethical purpose of a mentoring program are open to examination.

Research Questions

Other questions came up during the study, but the focus of this case study remained on two questions.

- How does power operate in the institutionalization of change in the new teacher mentoring program in Rio School District?
- How does the power of the district mentor and campus liaison/mentor operate as the new teacher mentoring program changes are institutionalized?

Operational Definitions

The following terms are important to the study. Although these terms are used elsewhere, the definitions of the terms are specific to this study. The references cited with the definitions are to indicate the origin of the ideas for the definitions.

- Acts of power: Acts of power are actions as words and deeds that act directly on an individual to limit the individual’s actions. Acts of power are done to the individual without the consent of the individual (Foucault, 1994).

- **Agency:** Agency is a way of being in action. Action includes physical activity, speaking, and thinking, and sensing. Borrowing from Massumi's (2002) definitions of intelligence, agency can be divided into instrumental agency and operative agency. Instrumental agency is when ways of action as movement, thought, and perception are specifically chosen to meet the needs of a situation. Instrumental agency involves judgment based on methods of analysis and evaluation. Operative agency is when modes of action as sensation or imagination go beyond the specifics of the situation to find how the situation could be other than it is. Operative agency involves wonder and uncertainty.
- **Critical surveillance:** Critical surveillance is based on the Foucault's (1994) conception of surveillance and discipline. Surveillance for Foucault is a legitimate right of government to look at the population and determine their needs in order to care for individuals. Critical surveillance is surveillance of the actions and words that are the performance of mentoring with the purpose of unmasking non-consciousness and opening up the awareness of the relationship of the structural and subject positionalities as determiners of instrumental agency. Criticality adds the dimension of questioning and troubling non-consciousness as a source of surveillance (Foucault, 1994; Massumi, 2001).
- **Institutionalization:** Institutionalization is the last phase of establishing a new program or changes in an existing program. Institutionalization is a nominalization in that it leaves out much about the procedures for establishing the program. It also leaves out information about the individuals and their roles in

establishing the program or changes (Fairclough, 2003; Halliday, 2004; Massumi, 2002).

- Looping feedback surveillance: Looping feedback surveillance is a surveillance and examination process that begins with a determination of program expectations based on the non-conscious reading of need for the program. It is also based on Foucault's (1994) ideas of surveillance, examination, and discipline. However, looping feedback surveillance is an act of power acting without consent and closing down further actions. In surveying and examining the participants in the program, the non-conscious read is projected through to sort performances meeting or approximating the program expectations. Those performances most like those of the program expectations are kept and emulated. Surveillance and examination of this sort is usually considered objective and formative. It measures against standards and helps determine future performance. The reading of the surveillance and examination is through the same non-consciousness that designed the program expectations. Three problems occur. The source of the program expectations as non-consciousness is not investigated; that is, the issue of the source of the standard is not considered. Second, those under surveillance and examination are usually not explicitly informed of the workings of non-consciousness in the setting of expectations. Third, the program more and more resembles itself. It becomes an idiosyncratic isomorphism (Argyris, 1990; Bolman & Deal, 2003; Foucault, 1994).

- New teacher mentoring programs: New teacher mentoring programs are defined as programs that instill in the novice the knowledge and practices of teaching so that the novice becomes a committed professional teacher (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004). New teacher mentoring programs can be categorized as programs in which mentors are “local guides” or “educational companions” or “agents of cultural changes” (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1992, pp. 14-15).
- Non-consciousness v. false consciousness: Non-consciousness is not unconsciousness or unawareness. It is not about not thinking about what is in the conscious mind or refusing to acknowledge what is in the conscious mind. Non-consciousness is about a practiced or habitual meaning that permeates through to consciously derive more meaning (Massumi, 2002). The opposite of non-consciousness is consciousness. Consciousness is recognition by the self of the indeterminate play of discourses that constitute the relationship between the self as a subject and as subject to social situations and conditions. It is a state of being conscious, but a state of being that is spatially and temporally unfixed. Non-consciousness is an internal relationship with perceived reality that does not register the potential of new perceptive/cognitive connections and retreats into habitual interpretation of experience. Habitual interpretation of experience is not necessarily sameness but follows from the use of familiar patterns of perceptive/cognitive connections. False consciousness is also about a relationship with reality, but socio-economic reality. False consciousness is a Marxist concept that is based not on consciousness as a self-awareness, but on class-consciousness

in the struggle for socio-economic self-realization. False consciousness is the unconsciousness of the proletariat about the way they are used to produce profit for the bourgeoisie. False consciousness is the separation of the worker's self because of membership in the worker class from the attainment of socio-economic self-realization. The purpose of unmasking non-consciousness is the awareness of the relationship of the structural and subject positionalities that keep the potential and probability of other thoughts and actions restrained. In non-consciousness, determinism of actions is not inevitable. The purpose of undoing false consciousness is to use class-consciousness to change the way of work. Instead of work being for the good of the dominant class, work would be for self-realization or the reconnection of the self with the means and ends of production (Sim & Van Loon, 2001; Macey, 2000; Massumi, 2001).

- **Positionality:** Positionality is the complex interrelation of bodily activities and thoughts filtered through an individual's ideologies, traditions, roles, and experiences at different times and in different places. Positionality involves the subject position and structural position. Subject position is about who a person is. A person's experiences, beliefs, ideologies, habits, traditions, wishes, and needs constitute subject position. Specifically for this study, subject positionality of the two mentors will be limited to mentor identity as defined by educational and mentoring experiences and accompanying beliefs. That does not mean that other constituents of subject positionality are not present. They are, but they are not emphasized. Subject positionality will be roughly analogous to mentoring roles. A

macro-view of structural position is the classification of a person into a societal class within the context of society. A more localized view of structural position is the categorization of a person into a job or position in the hierarchy of a bureaucratic organization such as a school. Subject and structural positions interact to shape the person and expectations about the person. Positionality answers questions about whom the mentor sees as herself and whom she sees as others (Ellsworth, 2005; Smith, 1998).

- Relationships of power: Relationships of power are established when conditions enable individuals to exercise their agency or ways of acting. Ways of acting either initiate or respond to other ways of acting. Two conditions are necessary for the establishment of relationships of power. The first is the freedom to make choices of actions. This is not about power to choose any action at any time. The second condition prevents that. The second condition is the absence of assumption that consent for action is given. This is not about asking permission of another to take a certain action (although that may be appropriate at times). It is about consideration of the consequences of the proposed way of action on the ways of action of another. For example, if a mentor chooses through instrumental agency to engage in a certain action, to establish a relationship of power she needs to consider the response of another to her actions. Does her way of action limit the actions of another or does it assume consent for the action (Foucault, 1994)?
- The space of institutionalization: The space of institutionalization is a reconceptualization of institutionalization that is more than phases and

procedures. The space of institutionalization is a complex conceptual space incorporating the mentors' positionalities, their instrumental and operative agency, the traditions, habits, and ways of thought of Rio School District and Lundgren Elementary, and the design of the new teacher mentoring program. The space of institutionalization allows for the description, analysis, and interpretation of the inter-workings of power (Ellsworth, 2005; Ellsworth & Miller, 1996; Massumi, 2004; Wheatley, 1999).

Overview of the Study

This case study describes how power operates or works in the institutionalization of changes in a new teacher mentoring program in Rio School District and Lundgren Elementary School. Chapter I locates the need for the study in the literature about mentoring programs. The study purpose, problem, and questions are also in this chapter. Chapter II presents theories and examples of studies related to power, mentoring, and institutionalization of programs. Chapter III explains the methodology and positions this methodology within critical analysis. Chapter IV presents the data, its analysis and interpretation. Chapter V presents the author's conclusions, the study's limitations, and suggests implications of the study on further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Power

Sources of power: The position-power link

Power can be thought of as residing with individuals or groups of people. Bolman and Deal (2003) define power as sources of power. These sources are position, information, motivation, coercion, control (of decisions and meaning), and personal. Formal bureaucratic social structures position people into jobs based on division of labor, decision-making, and specific obligations to authority (Hoy and Miskell, 2001). That is, categories of jobs in the school organization are identified in part by the kind of power they wield. What results is a hierarchical arrangement of jobs or positions that are linked to certain sources of power. For example, more organizational sources of power reside in the position of school superintendent than in the position of elementary school teacher. It is the source of power tied to the job description that partly defines the division of labor in the bureaucratic hierarchy of school district structure.

Common language used within the school organization such as boss, subordinate, supervisor, and superior name the position-power link in the division of labor. For the members of the school organization, the language represents a tacit and unchallenged understanding of the position-power link between individuals and groups. However, just locating power with certain positions even when accompanied by implicit understanding is an exercise in mapping or locating power resulting in organizational charts as graphics of bureaucratic hierarchy. This would be analogous to identifying the different sources of

electricity, solar, fossil fuel, or wind, and showing where they can be found in the world but not explaining how transformers, meters, circuits, and wires use those sources of power to connect to the power grid. Just like the power grid, understanding how the position-power link works within the school is more complex. It involves looking at how people interact in position-power relationships as they do their work. It also involves questioning the position-power link itself. The review of the literature on power considers the position-power link in light of Marxist ideology, Foucault's theory of governmentality, and feminist constructs of power.

The position-power link: Reproduction and resistance

The hierarchical arrangement of bureaucracies, such as schools, coupled with a theory of the production of labor gives rise to a Marxist view of the position-power link. In a Marxist view of an economic system, at the base are material productive forces considered the objects or the substance of economic production and the relations of production thought of as the conditions of work. Institutions and consciousness constitute the superstructure in this model. The purpose of schools as institutions is to reproduce the class structure of the economic base. "Specifically, the social relationships of education – the relationships between administrators and teachers ... replicate the hierarchical divisions of labor" (Bowles & Gintis, 1976, p. 131 as cited in Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 2004, p. 245). This results in administrative verticality, lack of control over work by those in the lower strata, and an emphasis on external rewards, all characteristics of a hierarchically arranged bureaucracy (Hoy and Miskell, 2001).

This theory of reproduction emphasizes the results of the position-power link. Sources of power can still be traced to individuals within the bureaucratic hierarchy, but the emphasis is on what happens when the position-power link is at work. The result is the perpetuation of hegemonic practices and the struggle that contests their reproduction. Hegemony is defined as “a process of domination whereby the ruling class is said to exercise political control through its intellectual and moral leadership over allied classes [and] “to the use of force and ideology in the reproduction of class relations” (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 2004, p. 250). The struggle grounds in resistance to the political and ideological control. But, before the struggle, there must be recognition of hegemonic practices. In schools, the emphasis is on educating the individual. However, in so doing, the larger context is lost; the way the hegemonic system operates without recognition of the power of domination becomes uncontested by teachers, students, and the public (Apple, 1982).

Criticality is a tool of struggle. Criticality is defined as “evaluative, public, multiactor, multiagenda, oriented to equality and heterogeneous well-being” (Haraway, 1997, p. 95). Without criticality, without assuming an evaluative attitude in a public manner that identifies multiplicity, the position-power link becomes hegemonic. If hegemony is operative in the school district, an institutionalized mentoring program will expect mentors to practice mentoring from a position-power link consistent with their place and role in the bureaucracy. The mentor’s place, her sources of power are utilized in a prescribed role that perpetuates and reproduces in new teachers the relations of production and material productive forces of the school. The process of mentoring as

practiced by the mentor reproduces the pedagogical and curricular interests of the school. The purpose of mentoring is to produce a teacher as part of the division of labor within the school hierarchy who adopts the pedagogical practices of the school. McLaren (1989, p. 176, as cited in Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 2004) refers to this as “ideological hegemony”. He goes on to say, “Customs, rituals, beliefs and values often produce within individuals distorted conceptions of their place in the sociocultural order and thereby serve to reconcile them to that place and to disguise the inequitable relations of power and privilege” (p. 245). The mentor position-power link is for the reproduction of meaning and practice within the school, the way things are thought about and accomplished.

As a child of reproductive theory, mentor *should* think and behave as described above. However, mentors are individuals. Their group identification is but one among many. As individuals, the mentors represent differing ideologies. “They [ideologies] are ... sets of lived meanings, practices, and social relations that are often internally inconsistent” (Apple, 1982, p. 15). Therefore, the differing ideologies of the mentors and the ideology of the district are not as tightly adjoined as theoretically proposed.

The school district is charged with the keeping of the hegemonic ideology, but in the process of maintaining this hegemony, the relations of the individuals to the hegemony become “antagonistic” (Apple, 1982, p. 18). This antagonism is the consequence of adopting criticality as the stance on the part of individuals and makes for the struggle of ideologies. Criticality becomes power as a tool of resistance. Resistance questions the use of the individual’s position-power link by others as a part of the

hegemonic reproduction of ideology. Thus, in the case of a mentor, she maintains her same hierarchical position as “a mentor.” However, her other sources of power such as information, motivation, coercion, control, and personal are re-thought ideologically to challenge the way other position-power links constitute what the mentoring program is and how she is to be a mentor within the program. As a resistor, the mentor reinscribes information, motivation, coercion, control, and personal sources of power as questions of ideology. Particularly, sources of power as ideological questions center around the purpose of mentoring as a production method.

McLaren (1991) gives this individual resistor a body and Giroux (2003) gives breath to the body and a platform from which to speak. McLaren defines the body in response to the tendencies of postmodernism toward over-representation and under-embodiment. “By locating the subject within the surface meaning of the image ... postmodern culture contributes unwittingly to the demise and depoliticization of the historical subject” (McLaren, 1991, p. 146). He defines the body as a “body/subject ... a terrain of the flesh in which meaning is inscribed, constructed and reconstituted ... the interface of the individual and society ... as a form of socially inscribed intentionality” (p. 150). The body/subject becomes the site not of one discourse, perhaps the hegemonic discourse of the school, but of several discourses. This multiplicity of discourse is not only the experiences, beliefs, and feelings of an individual, but also the awareness or self consciousness as to how those experiences, beliefs, and feelings make us act. “We must not forget that *we can act in ways other than we do* [italics original] (p. 162). It is the conditional “we can act” that invites criticality. Otherwise, individuals become the

products of enfleshment – correspondence theory in the particular. That is, the adoption of a discourse so that the individual identifies with the discourse and refuses to see the conflict or rub between the adopted discourse and the other discourses that are available to the self. As an example, a mentor takes on the meaning of “mentor” as defined by the school without consideration of the hegemonic implications of the role or of the other discourses that constitute his/her body/subject. Criticality is a “refreshment” (p. 162), being open to other discourses that constitute the self. Criticality becomes empowerment when all the discourses of self interface with the social/cultural milieu – the context of the institution, the school – and coalesce into praxis. Resistance is redefined as empowerment.

Giroux (2003) proposes a Theory of Radical Education that links to the idea of resistance as empowerment. He believes that teachers must “re-appropriate the belief that academic work matters in its relationship to wider public practices and policies” (p. 12). Giroux calls on teachers to question the culture, structure, and practices of schools by speaking with authority from the particular of an individual’s history, culture, and experience. Teachers must interrupt their thinking of themselves as individuals constructed by the school and as a member of a totality defined as teacher. They must unlearn reproductive pedagogical practices and hegemonic bureaucratic structures and divest themselves of the ideology of school as it is. This ideological transformation positions ideology not as a power for control but as an ideology of the positive. Positive ideology is a framework within which concepts are organized about what the world

means and what an individual's place in it should be; it does not pit one ideology against another and force an individual to act on one set of meanings to the exclusion of others.

This Theory of Radical Education extends the concept of refreshment (McLaren, 1991). Refreshment reconstructs the body/subject connection as flesh, as real people who are open to the recognition of the power of self-consciousness as the desire for empowerment and praxis. The Theory of Radical Education more specifically delineates the actions for and the results of such praxis. To engage in this transformational ideology, a teacher or mentor must use language to challenge the totalizing narrative of school purpose and structure for the democratic purposes of schools. This democratic purpose is people who are educated to "[govern] as agents who can locate themselves in history, while simultaneously shaping the present as part of a discourse and practice that allows people to imagine and desire beyond society's existing limitations and practice" (Giroux, 1992, p.22).

What resistance does is give the individual as a body/subject power in the school. Power is located with the individual, but the individual uses the power to critically look at the school's hierarchical social arrangement as a micro-representation of the larger world's structure of classism. As a resistor, the individual must critically look at this micro-world, recognize his/her own agency as multiply constructed, and employ a critical self-consciousness to speak and act in order to bring about change. Change is a break with tradition, a break from the totalizing of hegemonic power. "Authority, as the collective pressure to preserve traditional patterns and beliefs, gave way to the idea that the individual could be the center of authority" (Bowers, 1984, p.10). As empowered, the

mentor would not mentor to reproduce the pedagogical ideology of the district in the new teachers. Instead, she would use her position to call attention to the hegemony of a district determined mentoring program that allows her little freedom to mentor from the authority of her own knowledges, motivations, and meanings.

An example: Mentoring from a Marxist feminist perspective

Colley (2002) sees mentoring from a Marxist feminist perspective as based on a mythical Mentor – a combination person who both advises (rationality) and nurtures (emotionality). However, the emotionality, the relational bond between mentor and mentee in this case is a modern reading. Tracing the historical evolution of mentoring through a Marxist reading sees mentoring as portrayed in *The Odyssey* as a perpetuation of a patriarchy with no emotional bonding between Mentor and Telemachus. In a classical form, mentoring is revitalized as “a quasi-parental relationship between exceptional individuals ... [containing] an element of emotional bonding” (p. 264). Mentoring of this sort protects the privileged male’s position.

In Victorian times, mentoring’s meaning came to be associated with the help that middle-class women gave to those who were less fortunate. In Britain, middle-class women volunteered to help the poor “in order to improve them by presenting a moral example of the worth of diligence, self-discipline and thrift” (Colley, 2002, p. 266). By reporting on the “progress” of their mentees, deserving and non-deserving poor were sorted therefore creating a controlling mechanism for the dominance of the middle-class. Although much social good came from the work of these women, Colley’s point is that

mentoring perpetuated domination and transformed mentor into “a stereotypically feminine construct of care” (p. 269).

The persistent concept of mentoring as caregiver resulted in a domination of meaning – mentor cannot be otherwise than one who cares. The feminizing of the giving of care also casts the mentor into the accepted gender role of female that is a dominated figure in the hegemony of school practice. However, the mentor is led to believe that s/he has the power to transform and develop another person. When the mentor accepts the role of nurturer, s/he becomes part of the dominating hegemony and also stabilizes her/his individuality as a monolithic construction. Thus, reproduction of the concept of mentor is perpetuated – a feminized individual. S/he becomes doubly dominated, as a mentor and as feminine (Colley, 2002).

Colley’s (2002) read on mentoring illustrates how Marxist ideology and in particular Marxist feminism interprets power as reproduction of the hegemony of domination. It also emphasizes the role of the individual as pointed out by Bowers (1984). Criticality would be introduced if the mentor refused or resisted the monolithic construction of him/herself, broke with the traditional view and began again to act and speak in ways that antagonize or trouble the practice of mentoring. The mentor would be engaged in empowerment.

Another point that Colley (2002) makes concerns the intrusion of the power of the state into the relationship of mentor and mentee. So far in this discussion, the focus has been on the power of the individual to resist against the hierarchically structured bureaucracy characterizing most school organizations. Broadening the micro-world of

power relations among mentor, new teacher, and school opens up consideration of governmental power. Colley (2002) reiterates Marx's viewpoint that under capitalism, human relationships are based on an exchange value. The state needs teachers and mentors can help produce them. An economic relationship joins with the relationship of classical mentoring. Mentors' relationships with new teachers are not solely determined by an emotional bond but by the mentor's understanding of her/his role in producing an individual that meets the state's definition of what it means to be a teacher. "A relationship that is traditionally understood as dyadic is thus covertly transformed into a triad, with the invisible but powerful insertion of agendas determined outside the dyad by dominant groupings" (p. 263). The mentor is not only a nurturing person but also a tool of the state. From the Marxist frame, the governmental power of the state is another form of oppression, another target for resistance, and another stumbling block to praxis on the part of the mentor.

Relationships of power: Foucault's conception of power

Foucault (1994) provides a different conception of governmental power and another possibility for thinking about the power of the individual. His understanding of governmental power also suggests that understanding what happens in the institutionalization of a mentoring program means understanding the power of the state as represented by school districts.

Governmentality is the name that Foucault (1994) gives to

the ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses, and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power, which has as its target population, as its principal form of

knowledge political economy, and as its essential technical means apparatuses of security (p. 220).

Governmentality is about the relationship of people and things, the way of managing people and things, and of control of people and things so that people and things are secure and prosperous. It is about the power to bring into being institutions such as schools and mechanisms such as new teacher mentoring and to develop knowledges around them.

The state as a political form of power is charged with the government of the population. Population means the totality of the people and possessions within a land. Populations can be measured and sorted. This measurement and sorting and the knowledge that it produces gives to government a picture of the needs of the population and enables government to intervene to satisfy those needs for the good of all. From this, it might be assumed that the state with its emphasis on large groups and their needs does not consider the individual. Foucault (1994) insists, “the state’s power ... is both an individualizing and a totalizing form of power. ... [It is] a tricky combination in the same political structures of individualization techniques and of totalization procedures” (p. 332).

The state performs this feat through pastoral power, a way of doing power that has its basis in Christianity and its pastors. “If the state is the political form of a centralized and centralizing power, let us call pastorship the individualizing power” (Foucault, 1994, p. 300). The shepherd is responsible for his flock and accountable for each and every one. He is not only responsible for their lives, but their actions. The sheep

are dependent on the shepherd. The sheep are obedient to the shepherd, not to learn how to do something or to help make a decision, but an obedience that is an end in itself. Obedience is the source of self-control. The metaphor, of course, is the shepherd as the government and the sheep as the population. The care of the sheep is governmentality.

The shepherd also knows each sheep in particular. He knows what each sheep needs and what is going on in each sheep's life and in the "soul" of the sheep. The shepherd guides each sheep at all times. The sheep, in turn, are open to the shepherd. In Christianity, a person who is obedient, examines him/herself, and confesses his/her self-knowledge is assured life everlasting. The object of state pastoral power is not saving souls but ensuring that people in this world have health, safety, and well being. Because the state, like the shepherd, cares for the total flock or population, it also cares about the individual sheep or person. To provide this pastoral care, institutions both private and public are created. These institutions are enrolled by the state to give pastoral care and as such have pastoral power (Foucault, 1994). These institutions become part of the state apparatus – are institutionalized – because existing

power relations have come more and more under state control. ... Using here the restricted meaning of the word "government," one could say that power relations have been progressively governmentalized ... elaborated, rationalized, and centralized in the form of, or under the auspices of, state institutions (p. 345).

The individual is not lost in the governmental process. The purpose is to bring people, individuals under the care of the government, but in response to this care, individuality would be shaped in a new form, and submitted to a set of very specific patterns (p. 334).

These power relations are first and foremost social. "Power is not a substance. ... Power is only a certain type of relation between individuals" (Foucault, 1994, p. 324).

“What defines a relationship of power is that it is a mode of action that does not act directly and immediately on others. Instead, it acts upon their actions; an action upon an action, on possible or future or present actions” (p. 340). Power is often confused with violence or consent, but it is not violence or consent. Violence is an action on a body or thing that prevents the possibility of other actions. Consent is giving away rights or freedom.

Power is not necessarily adversarial. Power is not about the imposition of another’s will or the stubborn refusal to bend to another’s will. Power is about the conduct or the management of possible actions. Power relations can only be in a plane of freedom. All possibilities of action must be open. If a person can exercise an action, then that person is free and power can be exercised. It is not an either/or situation where a person is either free or the under the power of others. “At the very heart of the power relationship, and constantly provoking it, are the recalcitrance of the will and the intransigence of freedom” (Foucault, 1994, p. 342). What results is a continual rub or struggle of stubbornly resisting the loss of freedom. That is, of keeping an act of power from becoming violence or allowing others to assume consent when none has been given.

An important question that Foucault (1994) asks is how power shows itself. His answer is to reiterate that power is relational among people. He goes on to explain what power is not. It is not a communication relationships and it is not the capacity to get things done. But communication – the use of language – can be useful to power relations and the ability to get things done needs power. Power, communication, and capacity come together into systems or disciplines in mixes of different ratios that ultimately

define and describe the goals, work, and power relations of societal institutions. It is the way that people relate to each other as they communicate, plan, and work within the institutions that is the manifestation of power. Discipline and disciplining are not ways to induce obedience but are part of the systems or disciplines – “an increasingly controlled, more rational, and economic process of adjustment ... between productive activities, communications networks, and the play of power relations” (p. 339).

Because power relations are grounded in society, there is legitimate power. A boss can legitimately act with power on the actions of workers. But, this does not mean that power relations should not be analyzed and questioned. Foucault (1994) suggests five analysis points. Analysis on these five points keeps the field of possible actions open or ensures the viability of the power relationship. First is consideration of the kinds of differentiations that are made within the power relationship. What are the differences – cultural, economic, political, and personal – and are they a source or a result of the power relationship? Second is consideration of the goals of the power relationship. Is the result of the relationship to keep a privileged position or to teach a skill? Third is consideration of the way that power is exercised. Does power come through words, rules, or more subtle means of control? Fourth is consideration of the way power is institutionalized. Is power institutionalized as a loosely or tightly defined organization, a habit, or a whim? Fifth is consideration of rationalization of the necessity of the power relationship. What will be needed to get the results wanted from the power relationship? The analysis of the differences, goals, exercise of power, institutionalization, and rationalization can show

the point of provocation and the struggle of will to keep possibilities open; to keep the power relationship under control.

Foucault (1994) goes on to say that power relations can become confrontational as a result of strategies to win.

For, it is true that at the heart of power relations and as a permanent condition of their existence there is an insubordination and a certain essential obstinacy on the part of the principles of freedom, then there is no relationship of power without the means of escape or possible flight (p. 346).

Two interpretations of the power relationship are possible. The first is from those inside who are engaged in the struggle. The second is a more distanced view of the power relationship itself. This difference in viewpoint between direct involvement by some and observation of the relationship by others manifests itself in domination. Individual domination may be the result of clashes within the power relations. But domination of a group or class results when power strategies and power relations come together. While Foucault (1994) recognizes the possibility of domination, he contends that a careful analysis of the mechanics and techniques of a power relationship such as domination will result in actions that release the person. Although he does not specify actions, he thinks “there are a thousand things that can be done, invented, contrived by those who, recognizing the relationship of power in which they are involved, have decided to resist them or escape them” (p. 294).

Foucault (1994) says that his project, his analysis or study, is not about power but about subjects and the way people are made subjects. He concludes that individuals are made subjects as they have become objects of study in relation to language and

economics; in relation to their placement in a group or class; and, in relation to the recognition of him/herself as a subject. For Foucault, “there are two meanings of the word “subject”: subject to someone else by control and dependence, and tied to his [sic]own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power that subjugates and makes subject to” (p. 331). He goes on to say that in this study of subjects, he found that people are in power relations and there were no good ways to study these power relations. He also concluded that it is power relations, not the institutions of power, which need to be studied.

Both the Marxist view of power and Foucault’s view of power are based in the concept of the importance of the individual to change. In both, the purpose is to locate the sources of power. “... that is, the objective of the study is to identify the actors who control, and in whose benefit existing arrangements work” (Popkewitz & Brennan, 1998, p. 16). The two views diverge in how power is diffused. Although within any institution, the two conceptions of power operate and entangle, for simplicity of explanation, Marxist power is more closely aligned with what Foucault (1994) calls sovereign power. Sovereign power centers on the distribution of power, on who distributes and who receives. Sovereign power concentrates attention on the essentializing characteristics of groups of people. Domination leads to oppression of some people. Change comes about when the oppressed recognize their oppression by finding the source of power and calling attention to it.

Foucault (1994), while maintaining the centrality of the individual, also locates power with the state. Individuals remain central through their relationship with the state.

Foucault calls this productive power. As individuals come into relationships with each other and governmental entities like school districts, their subjectivity is constructed through techniques of surveillance, examination, and differentiation. Looking at the dynamics of power relations between and among individuals and governmental entities identifies instances of oppression and gives people opportunity for action. A Marxist approach to power looks at the totality of power, while through Foucault's conception of power the particulars of relationships are analyzed.

Colley's (2002) analysis of mentoring exemplified the Marxist or sovereign view of power. Mentoring as practiced constructs the mentor as a nurturer and therefore feminized. The stabilizing of mentor identity as essentially feminine puts mentors into a class of people. This group of people because they are "dominated" by this hegemonic view of mentoring cannot act in any other way.

An example: Mentoring in relationship with self, others, and schools

Bullough's study (2005) of the ways mentors come to identify themselves focuses on the centrality of the mentor as a subject for study. Bullough did not construct or analyze his study from a Foucaultian view of power; however, the mentor's relationship with her school and the university (institutions), her fellow teachers, administrators, and her teacher interns (individuals) and the conditions of determining what a mentor is (subjectivity) exemplify power relations. Bullough used Gee's four identity categories – Nature-Identity, Institution-Identity, Discourse-Identity, and Affinity-Identity. Bullough explains "that identity formation is not a passive but a dynamic affair, that involves a giving and a withholding which simultaneously alters oneself and one's context, with the

result that alternative identities may form” (p. 146). Although, this is somewhat essentializing in that each of the identities is defined in that an identity must fit certain fixed characteristics, the identification of the source of the identities – self, institution/state – and the social context of these identities partly illustrates Foucault’s conception of subject formation and the importance of the individual to determine progress.

The story Bullough (2005) tells in the case study is about Barbara, a mentor in a secondary school. Episodes involving recognition of Barbara and her work and her response to the recognition explore the kind of person Barbara was and was becoming and the expectations those around her had about her identity. Barbara perceived that the school or the university did not value her Institutional-Identity, defining herself with the role of teacher and mentor. The school did not honor the agreement she had about mentoring time giving her less time for mentoring than was proposed. Her role as mentor was not clearly explained so she used her own experiences about learning to teach as a base for her actions. Consequently, around administrators, Barbara was reticent to speak about her interns or her mentoring.

Barbara’s Nature-Identity, her main trait, was that of a mother to the interns. To her, mentoring was like being a mom and she spent much of her time nurturing and supporting her interns. “Barbara’s first responsibility was to love, protect, and support the interns, as she would her own children” (Bullough, 2005, p. 148). Barbara’s Discourse-Identity merged with her Nature-Identity. The interns admired her caring and compassionate nature and responded by acting like children who needed constant

support. Barbara, because of this trait set no limits for availability. Her other Discourse-Identity tag was of exceptional teacher. It upset her when other teachers thought her mentoring efforts were tantamount to getting out of teaching duties. The actions of her interns put her competency at stake. “Recognition of the intern’s competence doubled as recognition of Barbara’s ability, as validation of her D-identity as competent and nurturing” (p. 150).

Barbara’s Affinity-Identity suffered when the other teachers did not understand what she was doing as a mentor. She realized there was a separation between the other teachers and her because she was a mentor. Also, she did not think she was a part of the university intern supervisor group. Although, she and another mentor teacher in the school shared experiences, meetings of all the mentors were not frequent enough for a real bonding to take place. A close relationship formed between Barbara and her two interns; a relationship described by one of the interns as a friendship. But, since Barbara had strongly identified her role of mentor as a nurturer, the relationship for her was to protect them. She did not share with her interns the difficulties of mentoring which supported her identity as both a competent teacher and caring person. The give and take of a friendship was not evident.

Barbara’s identity as a mentor is central to this story of change. She is an actor who interacts with other actors in a continual struggle that determines who gains from the mentoring arrangement as it is constructed. The intricacies of surveillance (the lack of time for mentoring given by the school), examination (measuring up to the self expectations and school expectations of what it is to be a teacher), and differentiation

(acknowledgement of being mentor and therefore different from teacher and supervisor) create opportunities for Barbara and others to act as subjects in both meanings – “subject to someone else by control and dependence, and tied to his [sic] own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge” (Foucault, 1994, p. 331).

Individual power relations are the objects of the above-mentioned study. Foucault (1994) reminds that in the concept of pastoral power, power also rests in the state and works through the institutions of the state (government). In the case cited above, the school and university represent legitimate institutions of the state. As state (government) institutions grow, they become more complex. They produce and accumulate knowledge about themselves and their workings. The accumulated knowledge acts as power. This combination of institutional power and knowledge is what Foucault calls knowledge/power. This knowledge/power acts to discipline individuals. In other words, pastoral power is enacted. It is the way power is diffused. “The idea of the deployment of power gives focus to how the subject is disciplined through the rules of knowledge per se” (Popkewitz & Brennan, 1998, p. 18).

Even though Barbara as a mentor did not think she was given guidance as to how mentoring was to be done, the knowledge/power of mentoring was at work. Barbara’s identity as a mentor was disciplined by tacit cultural and social constraints of the school’s and university’s concept of mentoring; that is, knowledge/power.

Feminism and power: Identities, bodies, and place

Through Foucault’s conception of power as relational, the meaning of resistance is changed. Foucault refutes a Marxist view of power that thinks of power as something

that can be possessed, is part of a hierarchical flow, and needs to be countered because it is repressive. Resistance is not the redistribution of power from one group or class to another. In the case of female teachers or mentors, it is not simply a redistribution of power from superintendents and /or principals to teacher/mentors. Resistance is not a struggle that characterizes power between classes or genders or other role-defined groups. Resistance is the struggle that comes from individuals who are consistently in and out of relationships with self, each other, and with the demands of government like found in the institutionalization of a mentoring program. The emphasis is not on sources of power positioned in individuals or groups of individuals that materialize as actions to be used with some and against others to dominate. Instead, the emphasis is on what goes on between people and between people and their institutions.

Sawicki (1991) goes on to open up a connection between Foucault's conception of power as relationships and feminism. "In a politics of difference, difference can be a resource insofar as it enables us to multiply the sources of resistance to particular forms of domination and to discover distortions in our understandings of each other and the world" (p. 28). The sources of power are no longer position, information, motivation, coercion, control, and personal (Bolman and Deal, 2003). The sources of power are redefined as the differences between and among us. Using differences as sources of power loosens the position-power link. Resistance is no longer about using power to call attention to what domination does to groups of people. Resistance is about inherent differences and how these differences loosen the totalizing position-power link. In other words, through Foucault's understanding, resistance is not confined to a struggle based

on totalizing descriptions of class, gender, race, sexual persuasion, or other totalizing claims. Both Ellsworth (1994) and Haraway (1997; 2004) expand upon the idea of differences and the use of differences as resources to trouble totalizing conceptions of otherness.

An example: The power of difference

In her classic study of teaching C&I 607 Media and Anti-Racist Pedagogies, Ellsworth (1994) analyzed the way multiple identities and power operated throughout the course. Her concept of the course was to “define, organize, carry out, and analyze an educational initiative on campus that would win semiotic space for the marginalized discourses of students against racism” (p. 304). Her initial thought was to do this through critical pedagogy using such tools as critical reflection, empowerment, student voice, and dialogue. Critical pedagogy as defined in this study derives from the Marxist concept of the redistribution of power to relieve oppression. Power so conceived resides in groups such as teachers and students. A goal of critical pedagogy is to free students from the oppression of traditional school learning so that they will be empowered to act for the good of social justice. Empowering students in C&I 607 would create a unified desire for action against racism.

However, as she taught the class, Ellsworth found herself “struggling against (struggling to unlearn) key assumptions and assertions of current literature on critical pedagogy and straining to recognize, name, and come to grips with crucial issues of classroom practice that critical pedagogy cannot or will not address” (p. 305).

Ellsworth's (1994) tracings of her unlearning and relearning resulted in a critique of critical pedagogy. To begin her critique, Ellsworth placed critical pedagogy within the confines of rationalism by pointing out that the critical thinking skills used by critical pedagogy for analyzing "truth" are just rules for rationally supporting freedom from oppression. The pervasive use of the of Western, white, heterosexual male, middle-class tradition of rational argument for declaring the rightness of a point in critical pedagogy excludes the language of women and others. " 'The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house' " (Lorde, 1984, p. 112 as cited in Ellsworth, 1994, p. 306).

The use of feminist poststructuralism as analysis opened a place for student stories along with Ellsworth's (1994) own stories about their experiences with racism, classism, and other "-isms". Feminist poststructuralism allowed for the authenticity of the stories. These stories could not be presented or rationally argued since they each represented a "partial" (p. 306) view of the experiences. "... partial in the sense that they are unfinished, imperfect, limited; and partial in the sense that they project the interests of "one side" over others" (p. 307).

Ways of empowering students in critical pedagogy are through considering the teacher as a learner of her students; teaching students to reflectively think about the different choices open to them; and, accepting the inevitability of unequal power based on the concept of the common good. Ellsworth (1994) realized as she taught that these tools of empowerment did not work to counteract racism. They did not work because of the always-present partiality of her knowledge of her students, the way rational

argumentation silences the voices of others, and the impossibility of leveling the power differential between herself as a professor and her students. Instead she realized:

A preferable goal seemed to be to become capable of a sustained encounter with currently oppressive formations and power relations that refuse to be theorized away or fully transcended in a utopian resolution – and to enter into the encounter in a way that owned up to my own implications in those formations and was capable of changing my own relation to and investments in those formations” (p. 309).

During the course, Ellsworth (1994) and her students discovered how power worked to restrict open dialogue of sharing and equal recognition of experience. Instead they discovered they each spoke only from places of safety because they were afraid of misunderstanding, vulnerability, resentments, oppressions, and consequences. When they did speak, they often found that speaking from one position eclipsed or antagonized the position of others or the multiple identities and voices of the speaking self.

As the course progressed, students formed affinity groups and used them as safer places to speak. The recognition of the affinity groups as safe places from which to work and speak led to “building a coalition among the multiple, shifting, intersecting, and sometimes contradictory groups carrying unequal weights of legitimacy within the culture and the classroom” (Ellsworth, 1994, p. 317).

Besides a cogent critique of critical pedagogy, Ellsworth’s (1994) study places the importance on the multiple partial individual identities as differences through which power is simultaneously gained and contested.

If you can talk to me in ways that show you understand that your knowledge of me, the world, and ‘the Right thing to do’ will always be partial, interested, and potentially oppressive to others, and if I can do the same, then we can work

together on shaping and reshaping alliances for constructing circumstances in which students of difference can thrive” (p. 322).

Second, the study (Ellsworth, 1994) establishes the contextual particular-ness and place for the working and contestation of power.

The terms in which I can and will assert and unsettle “difference” and unlearn any positions of privilege in future classroom practices are wholly dependent on the Others/others whose presence – with their concrete experiences of privileges and oppressions, and subjugated or oppressive knowledge – I am responding to and acting with in any given classroom” (p. 322).

Third, the study (Ellsworth, 1994) suggests the embodiment of identities in power relations by briefly discussing the physical reactions of students. “Participants expressed much pain, confusion, and difficulty in speaking because of the ways in which discussions called up their multiple and contradictory social positioning” (p. 312).

The embodiment of identities and the importance of contextual place emerges again in a work by Ellsworth and Miller (1996). In a reading of Patricia Williams’ book *The Alchemy of Race and Rights: Diary of a Law Professor* (1991) they talk about differences as “multiple and fluid identities” ... “social constructions whose meanings shift and slide across times and places. ... Identities and difference are constructed, in and through the dynamics of our engagement with each other over time, not only in the service of oppressive relations such as racism and sexism, but also in the service of the *contestation* [italics original] of such oppressions” (p. 247). These differences and identities are the resource through which totalization and essentialization of identity are critiqued and power relations are disrupted. This is “working difference” (p. 248).

“Working difference” is not working through differences as in coming to some agreement

or working to refute traditional meanings of difference. “ ‘Working difference’ suggests a constant kneading of categories and separations” (p. 246). “ ‘Working difference’ [refers] to the possibility of engaging with and responding to the fluidity and malleability of identities and difference, of refusing fixed and static categories of sameness of permanent otherness” (p. 247).

The social construction of an identity is through relationships. Relationships do not happen to disembodied subjects. Therefore, the construction of identities involves not only the idea of identity but the reality of these identities as embodied in particular spatial and temporal places. There is description of the place or space of relationship. Ellsworth (2005) working with Winnicott’s idea of “transitional space” and Massumi’s concept of “a field of emergence” explains that both are similar constructs. They are both about becoming new again and about changing the self. Moreover, it is the subject/body that enters these materially temporal, spatial, and experiential relations with “*undetermined directions and outcomes*” [italics original] (Ellsworth, p. 33). Upon exiting this space, identities and social positions are “retroactively encoded as subjectivities, genders, races, and knowledges” (p. 33). The shift of identities as social positions that carry meaning beyond the relationship is not realized and named until after the fact.

The space of power: Bodies and movement

Movement and action of a very real kind displaces traditional meanings of difference as constituted by static positioning of class or gender. Instead, the identities of people are re-configured to some degree or other through the particular relations through

which they pass. This is power and as such kin to Foucault's (1994) concept of power as relational and active, therefore constructive.

Power is not a substance. ... Power is only a certain type of relation between individuals" (Foucault, 1994, p. 324). What defines a relationship of power is that it is a mode of action that does not act directly and immediately on others. Instead, it acts upon their actions: an action upon an action, on possible or future or present actions (p. 340).

The space, field, or relationship cannot be willed to be (Ellsworth, 2005). Any relationship can become a space or field in which constructive power is at work. The potential is a "flexible stability" (p. 32), a safe place that allows for identities to be questioned and reconfigured. The balance between flexibility and stability is precarious. Stability is maintained by "limits, forms, traditions, expectations, or conventions" (p. 32). However, stability could quickly be transformed into a "formation of power [that] may seek to impose stability by attempting to contain change" (p. 32). The key word is "imposed." "Imposed" stability implies power but the imposition does not necessarily need to come from domination by others. Stability may be self-imposed by those in the relationship as they choose not to be open to the multiple and partial meanings of identity.

The focus of Ellsworth's (2005) analysis of power grounds in her work with pedagogy and her desire to liberate pedagogy from "no-body's land" (p. 120). This land or place is represented by knowledges from the sociology of education and cognitive science "derived as they are in part from the natural sciences, [they] are both dominated by thought processes that produce grids, identities, positions, categories, linear progressions, and causalities" (p. 120). Positioned as multiply partial individuals and

therefore, different, teachers are free to question their relationships and their work as processes of movement or becoming not as occurrences of arrival. This is power of construction formulated within certain spaces and times.

The power of reconfiguration: Cyborgs

Haraway (1997) also considers identities, bodies, and place through her work with science and technology. She begins her feminist analysis of power in science and technology by examining male and female roles in science by telling the story of the development of the scientific way of life and technology. The story is worth recounting because it sets the stage for her considerations of identity, body, and place as constructs of power. In the seventeenth century, Robert Boyle invented an air pump. Public witnessing of the operation of the pump gave credibility to this invention. True to the social conventions of the times, only males – white males – could witness such a phenomenon. This witnessing cemented the separation of the individual, the subject from the object of study. Scientists, always male, were the translators and interpreters of this objectivity. They were cast into the role of a “modest witness” (p. 25). Witness comes from this act of observing and verifying publicly the experiments of a scientist.

Modest has a more elaborate etymological story. By the seventeenth century, men no longer could claim heroic stature by battlefield deeds. Thus a modest male, referring to descriptions of the legendary King Arthur, was a man of “measure, moderation, solicitude, studied equilibrium, and reticence in command” (Haraway, 1997, p. 31). Another factor in forming the notion of modest was the societal demand that women be pure and wholesome. If women were pure and wholesome, then men did not have to

worry themselves about chastity and instead could focus on the experimental world.

“Female modesty was of the body; the new masculine virtue had to be of the mind” (p. 30). This allowed the male scientist to work undisturbed by thoughts of the body. These thoughts belonged to females and were considered subjective – “reporting only on the self, biased, opaque” (p. 32). As possessor of objectivity, the modest witness, the white male scientist proscribed public witness as belonging to those like himself. These were the only credible witnesses. The public witness was redefined as a private witness closed to women and even to other males who did not have the required knowledge to witness credibly.

Haraway (2004) critiques the totalization and essentialization of both Marxist/socialist feminist and radical feminist ideology. In Marxist/socialist feminism the importance of labor as the place for reproduction and oppression is expanded to include the work of women, particularly the work done in the home and the work of mothering. The similarities of experience of working in the home and mothering for most women as labor operate as an essentialized meaning analogous to class but with the addition of gender as a determiner of identity (Haraway, 2004). Radical feminism bases the domination of women in the “structure of sex/gender and its generative relationships, men’s constitution and appropriation of women sexually” (p. 18). Woman’s identity is made up through being the object of desire of a man that manifests itself in a non-existence. Woman does not exist unless as a counterpart to man.

Haraway (1997) reconfigures woman’s identity and body and the consequent relationship to power by giving woman a standpoint or way to question and disturb

essentializing and totalizing configurations and practices. Haraway inserts the particular of woman, into the scientific way of life first created in Boyle's laboratory. As such, the objectivity of science embodied in technology represented by the male modest witness is changed. All the cultural and social interplays that create a technology must be considered critically. Haraway states, "Nothing comes without its world, so trying to know those worlds is crucial. From the point of view of the culture of no culture," [the world of objective science/technology as represented by Boyle's laboratory] "where the wall between the political and technical is maintained ... and interpretation is assigned to one side and facts to the other, such worlds can never be investigated" (p. 37).

Woman, as a new modest witness, is represented by the symbol of the cyborg. A cyborg "is a cybernetic organism, a fusion of the organic and the technical forged in particular, historical, cultural practices" (Haraway, 1997, p. 51). "The cyborg is resolutely committed to partiality, irony, intimacy, and perversity. It is oppositional, utopian, and completely without innocence" (Haraway, 2004, p. 9). Cyborgs are not the constructed human/machines of science fiction. Instead they are engaged in border crossings that disturb the relationship between and among humans, other living things, and machines. Cyborgs reside in a world that is increasingly technoscientific. Technoscience "is a form of life, a practice, a culture, a generative matrix" (Haraway, 1997, p. 50). It is the combination of science and technology that has produced relationships of humans and non-humans working together to define and redefine society, objects, and communication. The world of technoscience is a new place where the natural and the technological are more and more blurred.

McLaren (1995) points out that Haraway is talking about a location or space where work is “power-sensitive, not pluralist ‘conversation’” (Haraway, 1988, p. 589 as cited in McLaren, 1995, p. 66). He asks, “What better description of the classroom can we get?” (p. 66). In this location or space, objective knowledge such as that produced by the technologies of education and the subjective knowledge of the female teacher are in a field or place of relationship. It is in this place that the teacher as cyborg must use her multiply constituted partial understanding of herself and her students to question both the means and the end purpose of the technologies of education.

In considering power, the key is in not focusing on the constitution of cyborgs, but instead on “for whom and how these hybrids work” (Haraway, 1997, p. 280). “Technoscience is about a “worldly, materialized, signifying and significant power” (p. 51). What is important is who speaks as modest witness from the place of technoscience. Cyborgs as modest witnesses speak in order “to yearn for knowledge, freedom, and justice in the world of consequential facts” (p. 267).

Whose power is at work through what means is likened to the game of cat’s cradle by Haraway (1997, p. 268). The game is played by constructing string figures by moving the fingers to knot the string to form patterns. The string pattern can be slipped from one hand to another where it can be reformed. In much the same way as position is the stabilizing power in a “transitional space” or “field of emergence” (Ellsworth, 2005), so to, is the non-modification of the string pattern on the hands of a player. When a player chooses not to change the string pattern of the cat’s cradle, she/he owns the pattern. This is a symbol for sourcing power in a fixed position. In playing cat’s cradle

the work of many hands, literally, makes the game more interesting and complex yet non-competitive.

The undoing of the stability of identity position that signifies power for Ellsworth (1994; 2005) is the recognition of the dynamics of differences as embodied individuals as partial knowers of self and others engage within the space of a relationship. Thus oppression is broken. The undoing of power as dominance for Haraway (1997; 2004) is not so much in describing the cyborg's identity positions (although that is important), but the insistence on knowing for what purpose power is being used and how this purpose is being achieved. Thus, justice and freedom are achieved.

The power of standards: Location and identity

Star's (1991) conceptual web of science, social science, and technology are the context for critically investigating the power of standards or stable environments or locations and the power of identity. Science is rational and objective and as such becomes the authority and support for such activities as "sexism, racism, economic competitiveness, classification and quantification" (p. 32). Social science with its perpetual study of people has failed to acknowledge the capabilities and power of technology. Technology is a kind of "social glue, a repository for memory, communication, inscription ... and has a special position in the net of actions constituting social order" (p. 32). At the same time, technology captures these social activities and makes them invisible, transparent to the individuals who use the technology. Finally, technology and social science are seen as non-compatible as one is about machines and

the other about people. However, Star examines the myth of this non-compatibility by examining the relationship between technology and herself.

Star (1991) talks about her allergy to raw onions and how hard it is to get waiters and fast-food places to take her allergy seriously. Particularly as she tries to access the technology of fast food restaurants by getting a hamburger without onions at McDonald's, she realizes that she is outside the place or relationship with the technology. The technology of fast food does not work for her. The problem could be considered as one of misfit with standardization or as a self whose membership is in another social network that precludes eating at McDonald's. Instead, she chooses to consider McDonald's as a fact. A person looking at herself solely as someone who can't use McDonald's or as an aberration ignores the possibility that McDonald's might "have been otherwise" (p. 38). The self who *is not* eating at McDonald's is different from the self who *cannot* eat at McDonald's. The self who is not eating is "heterogeneity". That is that which is permanently escaping, subverting, but nevertheless in relationship with the standardized" (p. 39). The multiplicity of self is recognized in relation to the standard, but not as one who has been defined by the standard as an other or outsider.

Within the institutionalization of the mentoring program, mentors are made by the mentoring program. As individuals they have power. What is of interest is how they use this power as they go about mentoring new teachers as the mentoring program is being established. This raises the question of what happens in the institutionalization of the mentoring program when the mentor engages with other participants and with the design of the mentoring program. Is she resistant to the program design and is this resistance

grounded in the Marxist concept of classism? Does she recognize herself as being in relationships of power with others and with the program itself? Does she reconfigure herself within the technology of mentoring?

Mentoring in Schools

Mentoring has grown in popularity in public schools as a way to socialize new teachers into the profession of teaching through practical and personal learning, improve the effectiveness of teaching practice, assess teaching performance, and minimize the attrition rate of teachers in their first five years of teaching (Baltimore County Public Schools, n.d.; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Udelhofen & Larson, 2003; Zachary, 2000). Between 1990-1991 and 1999-2001 school years, the number of new teachers participating in some kind of mentoring or induction program has doubled (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, 2005). In 2001, thirty-three states had recognized the importance of induction for new teachers and had addressed the issue with statutes. However, out of the thirty-three, only twenty-two mandated and funded the induction programs (American Federation of Teachers, September, 2001). Even in the states that acknowledge mentoring through statutory action, there is much variation in the design of the mentoring programs. In particular, variation comes “in the purposes, length, structure, and intensity of these programs and in the selection, terms, training, and expectations of mentor teachers” (Norman & Feiman-Nemser, 2005, p.680). Feiman-Nemser & Parker (Spring, 1992) suggest that mentoring programs ask mentors to be either “local guides,” “educational companions,” or “agents of change” (pp. 14-15).

The purpose of mentoring

“Like the induction processes common to other occupations, there are a number of different, and sometimes conflicting purposes behind teacher induction programs. Among them are support, socialization, adjustment, development and assessment” (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004, p. 3). The definitions of mentoring and the purposes of programs convey the different emphases for mentoring programs. Murray (2001) defines mentoring and the process of mentoring in terms of development of skills. “*Mentoring* [italics original] is “a deliberate pairing of a more skilled or more experienced person with a less skilled or less experienced one, with the mutually agreed goal of having the less skilled person grow and develop specific competencies” (p. xiii). She goes on to describe a facilitated mentoring process in which the mentor’s main role is to structure the mentee’s inclusion into the organization.

The Texas Beginning Educator Support System (Texas State Board for Educator Certification, January 2005) proposes a framework of performance standards and developmental continuum that “illustrates how beginning teachers develop the knowledge and skills that comprise the complex act of teaching” (p. 3). Performance standards help the mentor and new teacher judge the level of the new teacher’s knowledge of in-class activities – learner centered instruction and classroom management and out-of-class activities – planning and reflection and personal interactions. The framework “defines the act of teaching and introduces teachers to the components of effective practice” (p.3). The mentor is to work through the framework with the mentee in order to evaluate and assure competency for teaching. The emphasis on the mentor’s

role in both Murray's mentoring program design and the Texas Beginning Educator Support System is on the development of the proficiency of technique. The mentor's responsibility is to help the mentee make progress in the use of skills and knowledge for job performance.

The Santa Cruz Induction Model (New Teacher Center, January 30, 2005) describes teacher induction as collaboration and continuous learning so that the practice of teaching results in improved student learning. The essential components for the induction model are: "program vision, institutional commitment and support, professional standards, classroom-based teacher learning, and quality mentoring" (New Teacher Center, January 30, 2005, power point presentation, slide 4). "The New Teacher Center is guided by the belief that learning to teach is a career-long developmental process that involves a continuous cycle of planning, teaching and reflecting" (U.S. Department of Education Office of Postsecondary Education, 2005).

The emphasis on the mentor's role in Murray's mentoring program design and the Texas Beginning Educator Support System is somewhat different than that of The Santa Cruz Induction Model (2005). In Murray's program design (2001) and the Texas Beginning Educator Support System (2005) the emphasis is on helping the new teacher develop job related experience and skills. In the Santa Cruz Induction Model, the emphasis is on continuous teacher learning so that student learning is enhanced. The emphases of the purposes of these programs are exemplars of the difference between casting mentors as "local guides" and "educational companions" (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1992).

[Local guides] concentrated on helping novices feel comfortable and have a successful first year of teaching. Limited by time constraints and influenced by official expectations, they offered advice and solved immediate problems. ... While helping novices succeed in their own classroom, [educational companions] sought broader professional ends (p. 15).

An example: Mentors as “local guides”

Edwards and Protheroe (2004) studied the work of mentoring through an analysis of classroom teaching by mentors and student teachers within the activity system of a British primary school. “A key to the definition of activity system is the *community* [italics original] which is focused on the object” (p. 192). They found that as the mentor (or supervising teacher) worked with the student teacher the mentor focused on the school’s practice of covering the curriculum and not on the learning of the new teacher. When analyzed, the mentoring acts of observation and feedback for the student teacher were found to stress the quantifiable – the amount of curriculum covered and the amount of progress made by students. The complexities of pedagogical practices were not emphasized for the new teacher. Instead, she assumed a “proxy teacher” (p. 194) or stand-in role for her mentor teacher who could be employed otherwise in the school to further school goals. “Mentors’ concerns were focused on how student teachers could get pupils to attend to the tasks that were set and to work through the curriculum” (p. 189). In other words, the expectations of mentoring grew out of the increased involvement of mentors as teacher trainers and as being accountable for student achievement. The design of the mentoring program based on organizational expectations of the mentor-mentee partnership inhibited pedagogical learning beyond reproduction of current teaching practice. “In many ways class teacher-mentors are doing what is required of them” (p.

185). The rules and model of mentoring coincided with a long-standing school and university conception of “ ‘teaching practice’ ... when university tutors would arrive, observe, feed back and depart” (p. 194). The ideology of the school that curriculum coverage would assure student progress and the ideology of the university that one-sided supervision of student teachers characterized the design of the mentoring program.

Mentors as “educational companions:” Programs of support and development

Anderson and Shannon (1995) and Roberts (2000) define the essential attributes or characteristics of mentoring. Both emphasize the process of mentoring as it fulfills defined functions within the context of relationships. Anderson and Shannon believe mentoring is “a nurturing process in which a more skilled or more experienced person, serving as a role model, teaches, sponsors, encourages, counsels, and befriends a less skilled or less experienced person for the purpose of promoting the latter’s (p. 29).

Roberts, in his phenomenological review of the meaning or essence of mentoring suggests that mentoring is a “process form” (p. 151), that is an ongoing occurrence. He breaks down the process of mentoring as “an active relationship, a helping process, a teaching-learning process, reflective practice, a career and personal development process, a formalised [sic] process, [and] a role constructed by or for a mentor” (p. 151).

Odell and Huling (2000) also emphasize the relational in mentoring as they define the mentor role as a component of a professional support and development system for beginning teachers. The mentor sees him/herself:

As a school-based teacher educator ... a facilitator and model of self-reflection, problem-solving, and instructional improvement. ... The mentor consistently recognizes trustworthiness and professional growth as the defining dimensions of

the mentor/novice relationship ... accepts the ongoing responsibility of building and maintaining a professional relationship with the novice (pp. 77-78).

Mentoring based in adult developmental theory places the emphasis on the nature, and quality of the relationship between mentor and new teacher. Through the relationship between the mentor and the new teacher, the pragmatics of the complexities of teaching can be discussed, reflected upon, and incorporated by the new teacher into her repertoire of teaching knowledge and skills.

The purpose of a developmental mentoring program is to assist a new teacher as she/he grows both personally and professionally through a meaningful relationship with the mentor. Daloz (1999) uses the metaphor of a journey. "For although journeys differ for each of us ... they do have direction, they have a common syntax, and we can mark our progress by the passing signposts" (pp. 4-5). Mentors are guides on the journey who "*support ... challenge ... and ... provide vision* [italics original]" (p. 206). Support means to affirm and validate. Challenge means to expose the need for new learning. Providing vision means showing the goal.

Zachary (2000) proposes a program based on Daloz's (1999) concept that mentoring is about learning and the processes of learning in the complex context of relationships, experience, and needs. The developmental program that she proposes follows phases of the mentoring relationship. These phases are the processes of the mentoring program. The mentor prepares for the relationship, negotiates for a mutual understanding of goals and activities of mentoring, participates in the relationship as a support for learning, and brings the relationship to a close. Within each process, Zachary

designates the skills mentors need. The skills cluster around building and maintaining relationships, communicating, and reflecting on practice.

Adult developmental theory

Adult developmental theory, particularly stage theory as the base for developmental mentoring, attends to “a kind of growth that does not inevitably come with age. [Stage theorists] are less concerned with the process of becoming older than they are with the question of growing wiser” (p. 48). The models for cognitive development (Kegan, 1982; King & Kitchener, 1994; LaBouvie-Vief, 1994; Perry, 1999) derived from developmental stage theories are useful in describing adult development and learning. They are designed to offer insight into how personal development continues into adulthood. These adult development schemes trace the cognitive development of adults beyond Piaget’s formal operational stage and presume a continuous change in thought that ultimately concludes with variously defined abilities to engage in dialectic thought. “*Dialectic thinking* [italics original] thus refers to a process of thought that relies instrumentally on formal logic but, more importantly, on the relationship of one idea to another” (Daloz, 1999, p. 138).

Reiman and Thies-Sprinthall (1998) relate cognitive developmental theory to teacher cognitive development by summarizing key propositions. They are:

All persons process experience through cognitive structures. ... Cognitive structures are organized in a hierarchical sequence of stages or plateaus from the less complex to the more complex. ... Each shift in stage represents a major transformation in how the person makes meaning from his or her experience. ... Development is not automatic. ... Behaviors can be determined and predicted by a person’s particular stage of development” (pp. 41-42).

Linked to cognitive development but conceived as different strands of development is conceptual complexity or thinking abstractly, ego complexity or knowledge of self, and moral reasoning or ethical behavior (Reiman & Theis-Sprinthall, 1998). Each strand – abstract thinking, knowledge of self, and moral reasoning – track as development from more concrete thinking patterns to more abstract manipulations of ideas.

An example: Support and challenge and cognitive development

Arredondo and Rucinski (1998) based their work on Reiman and Thies-Sprinthall's (1998) ideas about teacher cognitive development, in particular moral reasoning and epistemological beliefs. Their study looked at how mentors and mentees by using structured conferences and reflective journaling changed their cognitive stage levels. In the study, the mentors were educational leadership graduate students and the mentees were teachers at their respective schools. Each mentor-mentee pair engaged in reflection through conversation and journaling. The goal of the reflective conversations and journaling exchanges was "the provision of appropriate support and challenge to the mentee's thinking in order to stimulate cognitive structural change" (Arredondo & Rucinski, 1998, p. 4). Through analysis of journal entries, it appeared that both mentors and mentees showed movement toward higher levels of moral reasoning, reflective judgment, and changes in views of learning. "In addition, meaningful interactions about professional practices apparently lead to increased trust within relationships and stimulate both mentors and mentees to critically examine their work and to improve their teaching" (p. 12). The study showed the importance of relationships in the cognitive development

of mentors and mentees. The interchanges between the mentors and mentees helped each improve their practice.

Another example: Phases of concern

Another developmental model is based on the work of Frances Fuller (1969). As she worked with student teachers, Fuller noticed that their concerns changed during the semester. From this work and the work of others with beginning teachers, she postulated that early on, concerns are overtly about self-adequacy. Later, concerns were about the progress of pupils. “The evidence seems to support a developmental conceptualization of teacher concerns. We posit three phases of concern: a pre-teaching phase, an early teaching phase and a late teaching phase” (Fuller, 1969, p. 218). Fuller’s later work resulted in a proposed model of a teacher education program that provided for students’ participation in courses and experiences directly connected with expressed concerns (Hall & Hord, 2001). Also, the original hierarchy of three phases has been modified to construct the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (Hall & Hord, 2001; Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, & Hall, 1987).

Reiman and Thies-Sprinthall (1998) describe the way they use phases of concern in their preparation of mentors. In a practicum setting, future mentors engage in learning about mentoring as developmental supervision and work with a mentee. One of the activities is to identify the phase of concern of the mentee. Concerns may be assessed through: use of the Stages of Concern questionnaire (Hall & Hord, 2001, pp. 229-232); open ended stems used in reflective journaling; a technique called a “one-legged conference” (so named because it is to last no longer than a person can balance on one

leg); or, pre- and post-observational conferences. Based on the concerns assessment, a mentor can develop a plan of action that will appropriately respond to the mentee concerns. “The direct application of Fuller’s model encourages the prospective mentor to more quickly and more competently attend to the personal needs of his or her protégé” (Reiman & Thies-Sprinthall, 1998, p. 97).

Mentoring programs and power

In the previous discussion of power, the example studies of mentoring described the mentor as: the site of hegemonic oppression because of feminization of her role (Colley, 2002); a multiply constructed self who was integrated into a unified mentor role by the subtle normalizing of state pastoral power (Bullough, 2005); an instructor of teaching skills (Edwards & Protheroe, 2004); and finally, a person concerned with the professional development of the new teacher (Arredondo & Rucinski, 1998). The purpose of this study is not to evaluate the efficacy of conceptualizing a mentor as any one of the above. The purpose of the study is to describe how power works in the space of institutionalization as a mentoring program is established.

Different concepts about mentoring and the role of the mentor add to the complexity of the institutionalization of a mentoring program. Research is just beginning on the efficacy of programs. The problem of variability of mentoring programs hampers conclusions other than saying that assistance to new teachers particularly mentoring positively impacts teacher retention. “The content, duration and delivery of programs are so varied from one site to another that it is not clear to what extent general conclusions

about mentoring and induction can be drawn for any given study” (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004, p. 1).

The role and the work of the mentor are determined by the design of the chosen mentoring program. The mentoring program will proscribe the mentor’s chosen actions. The probabilities or potentialities of other actions may be either curtailed or loosed by the discourses of the mentoring program that is chosen.

Institutionalization

Change in the process of institutionalization

Institutionalization as the realization of change efforts is not only about the nature, characteristics, or kinds of the changes made. It is about the inevitability of change. It is about ways that bring about the acceptance of the changes. It is about consequences of the results of the acceptance or non-acceptance of the changes. Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, and Hall (1987) explain six key constructs of change.

1. *Change is a process, not an event* [italics original]. ... Change is a process occurring over time, usually a period of several years.
2. *Change is accomplished by individuals* [italics original]. ... Only when each (or almost each) individual in the school has absorbed the improved practice can we say that the school has changed.
3. *Change is a highly personal experience* [italics original]. ... If change is highly personal, then clearly different responses and interventions will be required for different individuals. Paying attention to each individual’s progress can enhance the improvement process.
4. *Change involves developmental growth* [italics original]. ... From studies of change ... individuals involved appear to express or demonstrate growth in terms of their feelings and skills.
5. *Change is best understood in operational terms* [italics original]. Teachers and others will naturally relate to change or improvement in terms of what it will mean to them or how it will affect their current classroom practice. ... By addressing these and other questions in

- concrete, practical terms, facilitators can communicate more relevantly and reduce resistance to improvement efforts.
6. *The focus of facilitation should be on individuals, innovations, and the context* [italics original]. ... The real meaning of any change lies in its human, not its material, component. ... Functioning in a systemic way recognizes that the school as a whole will be affected by whatever is done with respect to even its smallest part (pp. 5-6).

Wanting to institute change in a mentoring program and having a set of guiding principles only guarantees motivation and knowledge about the process of change. The purpose of the change, the gap between desire and attainment, and most importantly, the impact of the process on prevailing and individual discourses is the psyche of change. The interplay, the interworkings, and the interconnections of need and processes with purpose, attainment, and discursal impact is the “substance” of institutionalization of change.

Institutionalization: Phases of change

Institutionalization is considered the final phase in the process of implementation or innovation. “Institutionalization ... marks the final transition of a change agent project to an accepted part of regular district operations or to its ultimate disappearance” (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978, p.18). Institutionalization as used here is a nominalization of the verb institutionalize. Nominalizations of verbs leave out a good deal of information (Fairclough, 2003; Halliday, 1992; Massumi, 2002). In this case, institutionalization leaves out information about the roles of the individuals involved, their interactions, and descriptions of the procedures used.

The Rand Corporation under the auspices of the United States Office of Education Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, funded a study about the process of

changing an innovation into an accepted program in a school (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978). The programs or innovations pertinent to this study were federally funded programs known as “change agent projects” (p. 14). An important conclusion of the study found that within the process of institutionalization, there were three distinct phases of the process with different people responsible for different decisions at each phase. The phases are “mobilization, implementation, and institutionalization” (p. 13).

In the mobilization phase, school districts usually chose change agent projects based on familiarity or fashion. The process of choice was not based on a consideration of alternatives, but “consisted of a complex interplay among organizational forces, political pressures, personal motivations, and educational concerns” (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978, p. 14). The reasons for choosing a project had implications for the successful establishment of the project. But more important than the reasons of choice were the actions that preceded and followed the decision. The planning activities that led to the project itself dovetailed with the support that the project received. The involvement in planning of teachers, principals, and central office administrators affected the overall enthusiasm for the project. Four patterns of support evolved. The first, opportunism resulted from little support from the central office and project staff. These projects were political answers or brought in a money flow, and did not serve the district’s educational focus. The second, top-down support came from central office, but there was a failure to solicit support from the school-based personnel. Teacher resistance or indifference resulted. The third, localized support usually came from one or two schools wanting the project. Central office administrators were lukewarm to the project resulting in pockets of

success. The fourth, broad-based support included the support from all levels. Decisions were not necessarily democratically made, but there was a dissemination of responsibility and work. These projects truly became district initiatives.

In the implementation phase, the project was put into action. In this phase, central office administrator decision-making took a back seat to that of the teachers, principals, and other school staff. Because of differences within and among schools, the project was adapted. "Implementation was thus neither automatic nor assured" (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978, p. 16). In the process of nonimplementation, the project was given little attention by the users. In the process of cooptation, teachers adapted the project so that they did not have to make changes in their beliefs or practices. Few problems appeared in cooptation. In the process of mutual adaptation, the project, the school, and the project staff were changed by the process. This was not trouble-free implementation as everyone involved tried to make the project work. Although mutual adaptation did not ensure project success, it did bring about change. Change came about because teachers recognized that to make the project successful, they would need to consider the dynamics and context of their classrooms.

The decisions in the institutionalization phase reverted to central office administrators and officials. As in mobilization, decisions were often politicized and personally motivated. Discontinuation, of course, resulted when a formal decision was made to not support the project or when the project was ignored. Isolated continuation occurred when individual schools or teachers continued using the techniques and materials of the project. Pro forma continuation resulted when the project was interjected

into district policy, but teachers did not use the techniques and materials or used them in name only. Institutionalized change came about when the project became a part of the routine or procedure at the district, school, and classroom level. These successful projects emphasized broad support and planned for continual funding of personnel as the project was institutionalized. "...the groundwork and planning for sustaining a change agent project has the early, active, and continued attention of school district managers" (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978, p. 20).

Institutionalization: A procedural model

A definition from Hall and Hord (2001) states, "[Institutionalization] represents the phase of change process in which the change has been put into place and has become a part of the regular way that things are done" (p. 224). Hall and Hord present a procedural model for change, which if followed, results in the ideal state of institutionalization of the change. The assumptions of Hall & Hord's' conception of change are ten principles of change that represent patterns of change. Of particular interest to the institutionalization of a mentoring program are principles three, five, six, seven, and eleven. To set the stage for addressing power in this conception of implementation, the discussion will precede with principles six and seven, then three, and finally five and eleven.

Principles six and seven address the bureaucratic relationships necessary for a successful implementation and eventual institutionalization. Principle Six states: "Although Both Top-Down and Bottom-Up Change Can Work, a Horizontal Perspective is Best" [and Principle Seven states] "Administrator Leadership is Essential to Long-

Term Change Success” (Hall & Hord, 2001, pp. 11 and 13). In evaluating bottom-up and top-down change initiatives, the authors agree with the findings of Berman & McLaughlin (1978) that these initiatives are not successful. They advocate

For change to succeed, a major shift in thinking by *all* [italics original] the participants is needed. ... all the participants need to recognize that they are members of *one* [italics original] system, and that the only way that change is going to succeed is if everyone does his or her job well and learns to trust that members at other points along the continuum can and will do their jobs well (p. 11).

Administrators are cast into the role of creating structural changes and finding resources to maintain the initiative. They, as formal leaders, also should be the key facilitators of the change initiative. Administrator style also “has been shown to make a significant difference in the degree of success teachers have with implementing change” (Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 149). Of course, in agreement with principle seven, others also act as change facilitators. Second and Third Facilitators are internal to the school or district and have prescribed roles and functions. External Change Facilitators also have defined functions. Together, they comprise a Change Facilitator Team. Hall and Hord enumerate the functions of each change facilitator. The four most important functions of the First Change Facilitator are: “sanctioning, keeping priorities straight, providing continued backup, and providing resources” (p. 155). The top four priorities of the Second Change Facilitator are: “reinforcing, providing technical coaching, monitoring, and following up” (p. 155). The success of a change initiative is driven by the interactions of the different appropriate style of leadership of each role and the proper execution of the functions assigned to each role.

Principle three states, “An Organization Does Not Change until the Individuals within It Change” (Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 7). The individual gets the credit for the success or failure of the change initiative. The individual change progress is measured by the use of the change initiative by the individual and by assessment of individual feelings toward the change. To measure the use of the change initiative, eight levels of individual behavioral definitions form a heuristic by which individuals can be classified. “These definitions enable a change facilitator or evaluator to place an individual at one of the levels” (p. 81). Three levels are devoted to nonusers and are labeled “Nonuse, Orientation, and Preparation.” Five levels are devoted to users and are labeled “Mechanical Use, Routine, Refinement, Integration, and Renewal (p. 82). The facilitator of the change initiative determines by observing, interviewing, and analyzing the behaviors and actions of the individuals their Level of Use (LoU). The relationship between the individual user and the change facilitator is seen to be a critical factor in determining the measurement of individual change.

Concerns are the base for defining the levels of feelings or perceptions of each individual. The definition of concern is:

The composite representation of the feelings, preoccupation, thought, and consideration given to a particular issue or task is called *concern* [italics original]. Depending on our personal make-up, knowledge, and experiences, each person perceives and mentally contends with a given issue differently; thus there are different kinds of concerns. (Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 61).

The Stage of Concern (SoC) of each individual places the individual on a profile scale of seven stages. The first two stages are labeled self and concern the relationship between the individual and the change initiative. The third stage is labeled task and centers on the

mechanistic use of the change initiative. The final three stages are labeled impact and center on the individual's relationship with others involved in the change initiative.

Resistance is called “a natural part of change. In the CBAM work, most of what is called *resistance* [italics original] will show up in the Stages of Concern diagnostic dimension, especially self concerns” (Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 72). The authors emphasize two groups of resisters, those who appear at the beginning of the change initiative and those they classify as “real resisters” (p. 72). The focus is on the relationship between the facilitators of change and the resistor. Facilitators of the change initiative should recognize the early resisters are individuals who aren't sure they can do what is expected or are grieving over the loss of the way things are done. The timing and amount of information given by the facilitator of change affectively alleviates this resistance. Real resisters are described as those who don't understand the initiatives, who may have philosophical disagreement with it, or who are wrapped up in personal concerns. Again, the facilitator's actions are key to turning the resistor into a supporter. “What needs to be done to facilitate change in most cases is relatively straightforward: provide information, resources, and support that are aligned with the person's concerns” (p. 74).

Principle five states: “Interventions Are the Actions and Events That Are Key to the Success of the Change Process” (Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 9). Interventions are the day-to-day large and small actions and events that guide the process of the change initiative. The quantity of small interventions is credited with making a large impact on change initiative success. Principle eleven states: “Appropriate Interventions Reduce the Challenge of Change” (p. 15). The purpose of applying appropriate interventions is to

decrease the pain of change and increase gains. “If there is major pain in change, chances are strong that the leadership for the change process has not understood what is entailed and required to facilitate the process” (p. 15).

Mushrooms metaphorically describe a class of interventions. “Just as mushroom plants can be nutritious or poisonous, so can mushroom interventions” (Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 172). The growth of poisonous mushrooms must be controlled while the growth of nutritious mushrooms must be encouraged. The job of the change facilitator is to detect and name the intervention mushrooms as negatively or positively impacting the change initiative. Individual Stages of Concern are a source of mushrooms. Knowledge of Levels of Concern helps the facilitator predict whether a mushroom intervention is forming. The facilitator by constantly monitoring, assessing, and analyzing Levels of Concern and Levels of Use can spot potential mushroom interventions and plan counter-interventions to support or quell.

The noticeable absence of the presence of power

Berman and McLaughlin (1978) and Hall and Hord (2001) do not directly address power in the successful institutionalization of a change initiative. The theme running through both reports emphasizes the importance of the attributes and actions of the individuals or actors in this complex process. Berman and McLaughlin (1978) talk about the ability, capacity, and motivation of the teachers; the moral support and visionary attitude of principals; the special knowledge of skills of the project director; and the adaptability or flexibility of all. It is not known from this summary of the implementation study how actor attributes were defined, but leadership, teacher characteristics, and

management capabilities played a definite role in the “very complexity of the innovative process” (p. 22). The successful projects recognized the power boundaries of legitimate school district power and the power of the teacher in mobilization and adaptation. “The process that fosters effective implementation and teacher change is one that promotes each teacher’s ability, capacity, and motivation to accomplish this unique tuning” (p. 17). However, the sources, movement, and struggles related to power are not analyzed or elaborated.

Hall and Hord (2001) classify teacher concerns about a change initiative using the developmental heuristic Stages of Concerns. They categorize how people act as they interact with change initiative as Levels of Use. They categorize and rank the leadership styles of change facilitators based on six dimensions of behavior that correlate with initiative success. Hall and Hord state that “change is highly complex, multivariate, and dynamic” (p. 4). However, the classification and ranking of individuals presents itself as a complex matrix of functional interactions of positions rather than authentic interactions between subjective individuals.

The relationship between individuals and change in Berman and McLaughlin’s (1978) conception of change leading to institutionalization is to focus on adaptability and flexibility. Hall and Hord’s (2001) conception of change leading to institutionalization is about self-change in order to accept the program. Adaptability, flexibility, and acceptance are part of the exchange between governmental care and individual freedom (Foucault, 1994). It is not through the necessity of change, but the methods through which individuals are inculcated into programs that constitute the difference between

institutionalization that functions mainly from acts of power and institutionalization that functions mainly from relationships of power.

Some loss of freedom of action goes with fitting into the program. Constraining action through restrictive surveillance and discipline whether intrinsic or extrinsic; drafting people into the program through controlling acts of persuasion based on prescribed self-interest; and, not continually recognizing or reflecting on the presence of legitimate program alternatives are acts of power. Conversely, recognizing the necessity of examining differences as “partial” (Ellsworth, 1994 p. 306); contesting treating the self made into an object by concise definitions of program roles and acts (Haraway, 2004); and, exploring the potentialities and probabilities of not being in a relationship with the program establish relationships of power as “the recalcitrance of will and the intransigence of freedom” (Foucault, 1994, p. 342).

Both reports beg for the analysis of how power works as acts of power or relationships of power as part of the institutionalization of change initiatives. Berman and McLaughlin (1978) only hint at the possibility of a conception of power in describing the interaction of project characteristics and institutional settings in successful programs.

In the work of Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, and Hall (1989), work in which Hall and Hord (2001) are grounded, the tasks of those facilitating are given major importance.

It is not important where on the organizational chart the person [as change facilitator] falls; what is important is that facilitators support, help, assist, and nurture. Sometimes their task is to encourage, persuade, or push people to change, to adopt an innovation and use it in their daily schooling work (p. 3).

Power is not considered in two ways. It is not considered as kinds or extent of power from the power-position link inevitable in hierarchical bureaucracies. Neither is it questioned as to the effect of task action on others involved in the change.

In both descriptions (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Hall & Hord, 2001) of institutionalization, the people, their roles and functions, and the processes involved are well defined and described. Power is present in institutionalization and is made all the more noticeable because of the absence of its description and the lack of its analysis.

Power, mentoring, and the institutionalization of change: The braid of analysis

Thornborrow (2002) is right when she says,

Power means different things to different people; it is multi-faceted, and can take many different forms. It is often seen as a quantifiable thing – some people have more of it than others. ... We also conceptualise [sic] power in a qualitative way when we talk about such things as a ‘powerful performance’ or a ‘powerful argument’, when we describe someone as a ‘powerful speaker’, and when we talk of ‘powerful emotions’ or relationships (p. 5).

She is also right when she says, “Once we begin to theorise [sic] the concept there are complex and often conflicting traditions at work in explaining what power means and what it does” (Thornborrow, 2002, p. 5).

Intertextuality is about multiple texts interwoven in conflict and agreement simultaneously speaking historically through lived experiences and touching the future through a multiplicity of evolutions. Intertextuality of power, mentoring, and institutionalization form a rich soil for interrogation and challenge of the social practice of mentoring. Intertextuality grounds the analysis of power as it twines through the space of institutionalization of mentoring program changes. The intertextuality of the theories

of power derived from Marx and Foucault interpellated and interpreted by Apple and Giroux, by Ellsworth and Miller, by Haraway and Star interrogate and agree with each other, push and pull at differences, and conform to and confound the social. However, together they produce an archive of available thought from which to ask the most important question of all about the institutionalization of mentoring programs or any program for that matter: What should we do that is right in relationship with each other in the ecology of our limited and connected space?

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Definition of a Case Study

A case study has been used to understand mentoring (Bullough, 2005; Edwards & Prothro, 2004) and the meaning of reform implementation (Popkewitz, Tabchnick, and Wehlage, 1982) and power (Willis, 1977). A case is “a single entity, a unit around which there are boundaries” (Merriam and Associates, 2002, p. 178).

Stake (1994) says that “a case study is not a methodological choice, but a choice of object to be studied” (p. 236). Case studies emphasize the particular in that the learning comes from the case. In instrumental case studies, “a particular case is examined to provide insight into an issue or refinement of theory. The case is of secondary interest; it plays a supportive role, facilitating our understanding of something else” (p. 237). The case revolves around issues. The activities and practices that occur in the location of the case study bring to focus the theme or issue to be studied. However, the specifics of the case are the importance of the study. Looking at the issue through the particularities of the case may exemplify the issue or bring understanding about the uniqueness of the issues in a case or provide a platform for judgment of the case. Most centrally important to the choice of issues is what can be studied.

The case in this study is the work of a district mentor and a campus new teacher liaison/mentor as they respond to changes in the mentoring program being institutionalized by Rio School District through the office of the district director of staff development. It is bounded in terms of participants, process, theme, and duration. Power

is the broad issue of study. So, this instrumental case study will examine the agency as power of the mentors as they participate and respond to institutionalizing changes in a mentoring program. A case study will allow an in-depth description of the workings of power in the institutionalization of changes in a new teacher mentoring program in Rio School District during the first few months of the 2006-2007 school year.

Participants and Site Selection

Seven school districts were considered as sites for the study. As information about their mentoring programs was gathered, six were eliminated since they did not fit one or more of the site parameters. Rio School District most closely fit all the parameters of the study. The only parameter not met was the length of time the mentoring program has been in the district. The district new teacher mentoring program has been in operation for more than three years, which is long enough for it to be established as an accepted and practiced program in the district. Although the program has already been institutionalized in the district, the program was still chosen because of the changes it was undergoing.

Linda, a new director of staff development had begun her second year and had been charged with the oversight of the new teacher mentoring program. She instituted changes that significantly affected the program. She changed the role of the district mentors, added a new district mentor to the district mentor group, and added a new teacher campus liaison position at the campus level. The extent of the program changes meant that the changes themselves would need to be institutionalized into the program. So, although the program was not new, observing how the changes were being institutionalized offered the opportunity to observe how power operates.

Rio School District is a growing district on the edge of a large metropolitan area. It covers a large land area that includes the county seat, a neighboring town, several outlying small towns, suburbs of a metropolitan area, and rural areas. Historically, it has been a small town district but recently has been faced with the challenges of population growth as the suburbs push outward from the large city.

The director of staff development was helpful in securing permission to do the study in Rio School District. She suggested several elementary school principals who might consider having their schools become a site for the study. The principal of Lundgren Elementary, Ilsa, was amenable. Ilsa also agreed to be interviewed during the study.

Lundgren Elementary is in a small town located several miles away from the district office. Lundgren Elementary has been a part of the local community since 1979. Presently its enrollment is about 500 students from diverse ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds. Lundgren Elementary has participated in the district new teacher mentoring program before. However, it had been a few years since the school has had first year teachers. Ilsa chose Kerry to be the new teacher campus liaison and Kerry was willing to participate in the study. Kerry also is the campus mentor to the four new teachers on campus.

In the initial proposal for the study, the campus mentor was to be the main participant. Others at the district or campus level who had information about mentoring were to be included in the study if needed. At first, the district mentor was considered as a minor participant who had information about mentoring. But, as the structure of Rio

School District's mentoring program was laid out, the necessity of her inclusion as a major participant became apparent. The district mentor role has been a part of the mentoring program of Rio School District. Since the changes in the mentoring program also impacted the role of district mentors, the viewpoint of the district mentor about the institutionalization of the changes became important for the study. As it turned out, Amanda, the new district mentor was assigned Lundgren Elementary as one of her schools. She agreed to be part of the study.

Data Collection

Data for the case study was collected through interviews, observations, and other artifacts. The purpose of the interviews was to gather information and thoughts about the mentoring program in the district, the mentors' understanding of mentoring, and their actions as they worked as mentors. One interview was held with Linda, the director of the mentoring program. One initial interview was held with Kerry and Amanda. One follow-up interview was held with each. The follow up interview with Kerry was after an observation of a training session she held for the new teachers. The follow up interview with Amanda was after an observation of a district mentor meeting. Ilsa, the principal at Lundgren Elementary was also interviewed. The interviews were audio taped and then transcribed. The transcriptions were the texts for analysis.

The purpose of the observations was to see Amanda and Kerry at work in some capacity as mentors in the program. Amanda was observed during a district mentor meeting. In the meeting, Amanda's ideas about teacher induction and concerns about some of her new teachers gave insight into her work as a mentor. Added to this, the

observation also gave insight into the way Linda as district director worked with the district mentors. Kerry was observed as she conducted a training session with the four new teachers at her school. This observation gave insight into her combined role of campus liaison/mentor.

The artifacts used were the mentoring handbook, copies of the district made power points, and district training information. These artifacts were used as triangulation to confirm information and events.

Questions for participants in an instrumental case study are designed to procure as much information as possible from the participants (Siedman, 1998). Therefore, the planned questions of the interview were followed by other questions that probed for more detailed information and clarified what was said. Questions focused on the structure of the mentoring program, both past and proposed (institutionalization issues); the contextual meaning of mentoring and specific activities as mentors (mentoring issues); and, the ability to express idea about and practice mentoring in the mentoring program (issues of power).

Rationale for Choosing Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis was chosen as the means to analyze the data from the belief that language is endemic to social life. That is, language in this view is “not simple groupings of utterances or statements, but consist of utterances which have meaning, force and effect within a social context” (Mills, 2004, p. 11). Discourses are about what people say and are about what they *can* say. Discourse is “a particular discursive practice, or a form of articulation that follows certain rules and which constructs the very objects it

studies” (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 2004, p. 7). Gee (2005) distinguishes between the two discourses in his work by spelling discourse as what people say with a lower case “d.” Discourses, with an upper case “d,” he calls “language *plus* [italics original] “other stuff” (p. 26).

Critical discourse analysis concerns what people *can* say by analyzing what they *do* say. Therefore, power is influencing “discourse” and “Discourse.” Critical discourse analysis overtly works from the viewpoint that its purpose is to “make explicit power relationships which are frequently hidden, and thereby to derive results which are of practical relevance” (Meyer, 2001, p. 15).

Critical discourse analysis sees power as a main concern of language. Wodak (2001) states, “Power does not derive from language, but language can be used to challenge power, to subvert it, to alter distributions of power in the short and long term” (p. 11). Critical discourse analysis was appropriate to a case study about the institutionalization of a mentoring program when the issue is power.

There is not one right way to “do” discourse analysis (Gee, 2005; Fairclough, 2003; Meyer, 2001). There are also several methodological-theoretical links in critical discourse analysis (Meyer, 2001). The critical discourse analysis of this study aligns closely with Fairclough’s theory and methodology (2001a; 2001b; 2003). Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis also connects Marx and Foucault by challenging the effects of constructions of subjects through discourse as differentiated, dominated, and complicit to hegemony (Meyer, 2001; Mills, 2004). This study considers the effects of Marxist reproductive theory through subject and structural positionalities and Foucault’s subjects

as normalized and differentiated. Fairclough's analysis procedures correspond to the overall purpose of the study to critically describe how power works in institutionalizing the new teacher mentoring program.

For Fairclough (2003), critical discourse analysis is about the relationships among people, what they do, when and where they act, their beliefs and values, the objects they use, and discourse. This comprises social practice as "a relatively stabilized form of social activity" (p. 205). Through language people tell about or represent their involvement and others' involvement in a particular social practice. The analysis is about more than the description of the social practice. It is about the way discourse positions people; gives some people voice and denies it to others; produces hegemonic ideologies; and, allows or constrains dissidence.

Fairclough uses Halliday's functional grammar as his linguistic theory. Halliday (1994) describes functional grammar as describing how language is actually used. Halliday (2004) sees the purpose of language as "making sense of our experience, and acting out our social relationships" (p. 29). He conceives language as structured into construing messages, involving exchange, and representing experiences. That means that in texts, language is about a certain theme or what is important to the author of the text; language is about exchanging information or making demands; and, language is about differentiating types of experiences as being, doing, and sensing. Text can be analyzed by looking at clauses and groups of clauses for theme (message), mood (interpersonal), and processes (types of experiences). Different grammatical forms such as phrases, verb types and tenses, kinds of sentences, and others point out message, mood, and processes.

Halliday (1994;2004) also includes analyzing relationships between word choices as part of making meaning of the text.

Not all forms of grammar and lexis are used to critically analyze a text. The forms used to analyze the texts in this case study work to elucidate power and show how power is challenged. Some of the grammatical and lexical forms used in the critical discourse analysis are suggested in Fairclough's (2001a; 2001b; 2003) works. Others are suggested in Halliday's (1994; 2004) works. The grammatical and lexical forms used in the critical analysis of the texts in this study describe agency, positionality, differentiation, normalization, hegemony, and legitimization as evidence of the workings of power. Besides, grammatical and lexical forms, rhetorical forms are analyzed particularly as they relate to the interpersonal or exchange function of language.

The key grammatical, lexical, and rhetorical forms used in this case study are:

- Theme as the concern or concerns of the author in a portion of text (Fairclough, 2003; Halliday, 1994; 2004).
- The use of propositions as clauses or sentences that give information. The use of proposals as clauses or sentences demanding or commanding (Fairclough, 2003; Halliday, 1994; 2004).
- The use of logical constructs of rhetoric such as description, definition, comparison and contrast, and narration (Hughes & Duhamel, 1967; Rockas, 1967).
- The processes that represent experiences as either internal to the actor (mental processes), external to the actor (material processes), identifying or classifying

(relational processes), or operating between the above as verbal, behavioral, or existential (Halliday, 1994; 2004).

- Nominalizations as a “grammatical metaphor” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 220) that generalize and disguise agency and processes.
- Mental and verbal projections as a separation between the content of the idea and the process of reporting. Projections are the difference between the person’s thinking and saying and what he/she thinks or speaks about (Halliday, 2004).
- Metaphors as comparative representations of events that relate to other events. Metaphors can appropriate and hide meaning in the translation from one context to another (Fairclough, 2003; Halliday, 2004).
- Expansion of propositions through elaborating, extending, and enhancing language forms (Halliday, 1994; 2004).
- Lexical cohesion through the use of word repetition, synonymy, hyponymy, meronymy, and reference (Halliday, 1994; 2004).
- Modality as commitment of the author to the expressed ideas or feelings or actions (Fairclough, 2003; Halliday, 2004).

Text Analysis

Each text was analyzed using the grammatical, lexical, and rhetorical forms listed above. This was not a linear process of moving from one form to another or a sequential process of moving through each text. Instead, it was a hermeneutic-like process of finding meaning (Meyer, 2001). Each text, Linda’s, Amanda’s, and Kerry’s, and Ilisa’s

about the establishment of the changes in the mentoring program is a part of the whole story. To analyze each text, there had to be a continuous movement from the meaning of individual instances of grammar, lexis, and rhetoric in each text to the meaning of the whole text and then back to the individual texts. Then each text had to be analyzed in relationship to each other text and the whole. The process continued until the instances of the workings of power were analyzed and described.

The literature on critical discourse analysis points out two limitations connected to this process. First is the predilection of looking for instances of the workings of power. The criticism is that critical discourse analysis in looking for instances of power in texts is biased toward a critical orientation. This criticism is countered with the fact that critical discourse analysis is explicit as to its purpose of its analysis – that language is part of the working of power (Meyer, 2001; Wodak, 2001).

Second, is the matter of involvement of the researcher in the interpretation of the text. Fairclough (2001a) describes this as a fractal-like process where what the researcher does as interpreter is quasi-iterative of what the participants do. The participants create texts by interpreting their social situations and expressing their interpretations in language. The researcher interprets these texts by considering her social situations and interacting with the language cues of grammar, lexis, and rhetoric. The researcher has two responsibilities at this point. First, to make clear what is being done to interpret the text. That includes explaining not only the analysis and relating it to the interpretation processes, but also to be conscious of the effects of questioning power on the participants

and their texts. Second, to draw from social theory, in this case, theories about power, as a source of interpretation.

Data Representation

Representation must be carefully considered since it is the public display of the data, analysis, and interpretation of the study. Representation of the stories should reflect what Tierney (1998) says “are mutual undertakings between author and interviewee” (p. 67). Goodall (2000) also reminds that the researcher must be aware of “the power of the rhetorical form to shape a reader’s understanding” (p. 69). The trinity – researcher, participants, and readers – each has a part in determining representation. Tierney says,

The researcher, involved in a constant act of interpretation, first needs to translate what he or she hears from an interviewee and then needs to present the data in a particular manner that is itself another act of interpretation. The reader concludes the series with his or her own interpretation. The research act becomes a metaphor about reading” (p. 61).

The words or texts of the participants, Amanda, Kerry, Linda, and Ilsa, carry their stories of the way power works as the changes in the mentoring program were established. Their words are represented in extended passages so that the flow of ideas is not broken. Occasionally, Amanda, Kerry, Linda, and Ilsa’s words were interposed with each other. The purpose was to represent different stories about the same happenings or information.

Following Fairclough’s (2001a) advice, the analysis of the text is thoroughly explained following extended passages. Then, the analysis is related to a construct or idea from a theory of power. The title of each piece of text, analysis, and interpretation relates

to the construct. The proximity of actual text with the explanation of analysis and the interpretation is meant to invite the reader to respond.

Twice, a descriptive observational script appears. The first is a script of a district mentor meeting. The second is a script of the campus liaison/mentor training new teachers. There is purposely no analysis or interpretation with either of these so that the reader may interact with them.

Trustworthiness

Creswell (1998) advises that researchers in case studies use terms that are parallel to those used by quantitative researchers. Lincoln and Guba (1985) use the terms credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability as parallel to internal validity, external validity, reliability, and objectivity. Taken together, these terms mean that the study is trustworthy. Lincoln and Guba pose a central question as to trustworthiness. “How can an inquirer persuade his or her audiences (including self) that the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to, worth taking account of” (p. 209)?

Trustworthiness was established through the use of

- Triangulation of sources (credibility). Different participants talked about the same information and events. The district mentor handbook, mentor training information, and copies of the power points confirmed information and events.
- Member checking (credibility). The participants responded to the study. Each confirmed the events and information that each gave during the interviews.

- An audit trail (confirmability). Transcripts, data analysis procedures, observation notes, working “hypotheses,” and personal notes were kept.
- Reference to previous grammatical, linguistic and discourse analysis (dependability). A corpus of work of language analysis has established meanings associated with certain grammatical and linguistic forms (Halliday, 1994; 2004; Fairclough, 2001a; 2003).
- Clear explanation of the analysis and relation of the analysis to interpretation (confirmability) (Fairclough, 2001a).

As to transferability, Lincoln & Guba (1985) state that it is

not [italics original] the naturalist’s task to provide an *index* [italics original] of transferability; it *is* [italics original] his or her responsibility to provide the *data base* [italics original] that makes transferability judgments possible on the part of potential appliers (p. 316).

Limitations to Trustworthiness

Although effort was made to establish trustworthiness, the context of the study and the methodology of the study limited trustworthiness. Limitations to trustworthiness were:

- The short duration of the study.
- The difficulties of structuring time with the participants.
- Researcher and ideological bias as discussed above.

CHAPTER IV

DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS

The Space of Institutionalization

Institutionalization is defined as the naturalization of a new structure into the workings of a school district (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Hall & Hord, 2001). It is about making a change or a new program permanent. Space, place, and field are conceptual metaphors frequently used in organizational representations. Organizational space has been considered as a field of unknown and unseen forces of change (Wheatley, 1999) and a place of cultural mediation between physical bodies and change (Massumi, 2002). As such, institutionalization can be thought of as a space for processes of determining need, processes for implementing structures and concepts, and processes of evaluating outcomes. It is also a space for the interactions of people with each other and with the processes. It is within the space of the institutionalization of a revised new teacher mentoring program that Amanda, the district mentor, Kerry, the campus based liaison/mentor, and Linda, as the district director of staff development interact.

Agency

The meaning of agency is being in action. Massumi (2002) defines agency as the “expression of intelligence in needful and useful action” (Massumi, 2002, p. 128). Intelligence is both instrumental reason and operative reason. “Instrumental reason[ing] is the extension of need into utility; a greater co-presence of possibilities that enables a systematic construction of a combinatoric and, ... a calculated choice between possible next connections” (p. 95). In other words, reasoning or thinking instrumentally restricts

all probabilities or potentialities of action into a few chosen possibilities. Operative reasoning deals with the probabilities or potentialities. “It is *pragmatic* [italics original] rather than analytic” (p. 112). It does not analyze to make choices. Instead operative reasoning invents actions and is more closely kin to lateral thinking, improvisation, or “intuition” (p. 112).

Borrowing from Massumi (2002), agency, being in action, can then be further defined as either instrumental or operative. Instrumental agency is when modes of action as movement, thought, and perception are specifically chosen to meet the needs of a situation. Instrumental agency involves judgment based on methods of analysis and evaluation. Operative agency is when modes of action as sensation or imagination go beyond the specifics of the situation to find how the situation could be other than it is. Operative agency involves wonder, intuition, and uncertainty. Amanda, Kerry, and Linda all evidence both kinds of agency in the space of institutionalization of the mentoring program.

Positionality

People are positioned in the space of institutionalization. Positionality is the complex interrelation of bodily activities and thoughts filtered through an individual’s ideologies, traditions, roles, and experiences at different times and in different places. Positionality answers questions about whom the person sees as herself and whom she sees as others (Ellsworth, 2005). Positionality involves subject position and structural position.

The concept of structural position is “that an individual is structurally positioned within hierarchical social, cultural, political and economic systems by forces and institutions that are prior to her will. Further, these structural positions shape the individual’s life chances ...” (Smith, 1998, p. 56). In the context of institutionalization of a mentoring program, the people are positioned within the bureaucratic hierarchy of the school district. They are positioned by the traditions of past mentoring programs, the mind-set of school boards and others, and the availability of resources. These structural forces shape their “life chances” as participants in the mentoring program.

Following Laclau and Mouffe, Smith (1998) adds, “that a “subject position” is like an “identity”... A ‘subject position’ refers to the ensemble of beliefs through which an individual interprets and responds to her structural positions within a social formation.” (p. 58). Although subject positions are constituted by a lifetime of experiences and beliefs, in the context of this study, the subject positions of Amanda and Kerry will be limited to the mentor identity as defined by educational and mentoring experiences and accompanying beliefs. Their subject position will be roughly analogous to their mentoring roles.

A grid is a way to picture positionality in the space of institutionalization. A grid laid over the space of institutionalization would form spaces at the intersection of the columns and rows. Amanda as the district mentor, Kerry as the campus based liaison mentor, and Linda, as the program director would each have a space on that grid. The intersection of the column space representing structural position with the row space representing subject position would designate the boundaries of each person’s

positionality. Within each space, Amanda, Kerry, and Linda are in action. Linda, Amanda, and Kerry tell their stories from the institutionalization of the mentoring program in Rio School district from their positionalities.

Legitimacy

For Foucault (1994) governmentality is the legitimate concern of the state as it develops and uses knowledges in order to manage and control people and things for security and prosperity. Governance actualizes governmentality by establishing legitimate authority to control and sites power with those in authority.

In Rio School District, legitimate authority and power for the new teacher mentoring program is with Linda as the program director. The school district has had a new teacher mentoring program for about four years. So, the idea of having mentoring help for new teachers is established or institutionalized as part of the structure and culture of the school district. But, as the new director of staff development that includes oversight of the mentoring program, Linda has made changes in the program.

Linda: This is my second year. I was here all year last year. And coming on board, it was just explained to me that that [the mentoring program] was one of my duties. And so as a former principal, or course I worked with campus mentors. So I knew ... all about the program and pretty much what the expectations were. It was just a matter of learning what was in place. And kind of making a decision about what changes needed to be made.

Question: What decisions or changes did you make?

Linda: We did a survey of all the brand new teachers to find out whether or not it [the mentoring program] was meeting their expectations ... that the mentor program as it was currently structured was being a support to them to the maximum that it could. And we also met with new teachers on a regular basis to receive feedback in a more informal way. And all of that data was analyzed and it was determined that there wasn't any structure to it [the mentoring program]. The

district mentors that we had would kind of just come and stop by and how are you doing; serving sort of a nurturer, mother type help role. And the campus mentors ... there was no accountability there as far as structure and expectations. ... They didn't meet on a continuous basis. Some met real religiously throughout the year and had a great relationship. And some were not meeting at all.

“And coming on board”, it was just explained to me that that [the mentoring program] was one of my duties.” The theme of this sentence “And coming on board” is circumstantial. Halliday (1994) explains that “the theme is the element which serves as the point of departure of the message; it is that which the clause is concerned” (p. 37). Circumstance as a theme sets a context. The circumstance of being in a new place at a certain time is what Linda wants to tell about. One of the circumstances of being new to the position is that she received an explanation of her duties. Therefore, Linda is positioned by the district to have legitimate authority to manage and direct the mentoring program. Fairclough (2003) calls this authorization. Authorization is “legitimation by reference to the authority of tradition, custom, law, and of persons in whom some kind of institutional authority is vested” (p. 98).

Linda sees two things needing to be done as she takes on her new position. “It was just a matter of learning what was in place and kind of making a decision about what changes needed to be made.” “A matter of learning” and “kind of making” are the themes of this sentence. “It” which is in the theme position in the sentence identifies with “a matter of learning” and “kind of making;” as a thematic equative (Halliday, 1994). Linda's concern is about the events of gaining knowledge about the mentoring program and deciding what needs to be done with that knowledge.

Linda first describes the procedure for gaining knowledge about the mentoring program. Material processes dominate her description. Material processes concern the “‘outer’ experience ... of actions and events: things happen, and people or other actors, do things, or make them happen” (Halliday, 1994, p. 106). “We did a survey” and “we also met ... to receive feedback,” indicate that Linda and undesigned others acted in order to get information. Linda and others gained information from the new teachers. The prepositional phrases “of all the brand new teachers” and “with the new teachers” tell more about the survey and the meetings. Surveying and meeting with new teachers gave Linda and others information or knowledge about the mentoring program as it existed and comprised the first steps in the procedure of gathering knowledge about the mentoring program.

Linda describes the results of the analysis of the mentoring program through the use of nominalizations and metaphors. Massumi (2002) defines nominalization. “When we speak of “an” object or thing, what we are referring to is a complex interweaving of attributes and contents as subsumed under a nominal identity (a name)” (p. 216). Halliday (1994) explains nominalizations as words that are usually used as verbs, but instead are used as nouns. Fairclough (2003) explains that in a nominalization some information is lost. For example, “there wasn’t any structure to it.” “Structure” as a verb is changed to “structure” as a noun. Information about the individuals who structure the mentoring program and the circumstances of the structuring are missing. Linda states, “There was no accountability there.” “Accountability” as the noun has lost some of the meaning it would carry if it were expressed as the verb, “account.” Fairclough reminds that

nominalizations subsume detailed meaning. They shorthand or simplify. Nominalizations are helpful for “generalizing and abstracting ... indispensable ... for science, but can also obfuscate agency and responsibility” (p. 220).

The nominalizations “structure” and “accountability” are expressed as existential processes: “there wasn’t any structure to it [the mentoring program]” and “there was no accountability there as far as structure and expectations.” Existential processes are “the processes concerned with existence ... by which phenomena of all kinds are simply recognized to ‘be’ – to exist, or to happen” (Halliday, 1994, p. 107).

In functional grammar polarity refers to “the choice between positive and negative” (Halliday, 1994, p. 88). In the case of “wasn’t,” the meaning is an assertion of it isn’t so. In Linda’s description, it isn’t so that structure exists or is happening. In the case “accountability,” “no” operates as a total determiner meaning that none of any part of the identified thing – “accountability” – exists or is happening (Halliday, 1994).

Metaphors are used to support the assertion of the lack of structure in the mentoring program. Metaphors are verbal pictures of comparison, description in words. Description can be literal or impressionistic. “It is objective if it attempts to portray its subject as it actually exists ... It is impressionistic when it attempts to present an interpretation of its subject” (Hughes & Duhamel, 1967, p. 239). The first metaphor Linda uses “kind of hit or miss” is more impressionistic. Linda describes the work of the campus mentors metaphorically as “kind of hit or miss.” Since this is a metaphor from either sport or combat, Linda is comparing the work of the campus mentors to sometimes “making the target” and at other times the work as “going some place other than the

target.” The target in Linda’s description is for the mentors to be a maximal support to the new teachers. Linda elaborates on the hit or miss nature of both the district and campus mentors’ work by saying, “The district mentors that we had would kind of just come and stop by and how are you doing.” Of the campus mentors, she says, “They didn’t meet on a continuous basis.”

Linda continues to use metaphors to describe how the campus and district mentors perform their jobs. The metaphors of “sort of a nurturer, mother type help role” “some met real religiously”, and “just mentors ... in name only” in reference to the campus mentors creates an impression of mentoring as focused primarily on support and care. Linda’s metaphors also create an impression of variance in the level of commitment to the job of mentoring. All in all, Linda uses metaphors to support her contention about the lack of structure and accountability in the mentoring program.

Linda continues by telling about the changes in the program.

Linda: Rio School District has grown by leaps and bounds in terms of alignment. ... They have a newly established curriculum in all areas. They have common assessments district wide. ... So, yet still there are still teachers that are kind of stuck in their old way of thinking and we, my goal is that the new teachers coming in don’t get sucked into that. And the mentors are knowledgeable about these new initiatives and how to align the curriculum and how the assessments, the curriculum, and the instruction should all align ... But, I want them [district mentors] to help us [the district] get that off the ground.

The theme of the first passage above is Rio School District. The theme is repeated with the referent “they.” “They have a newly established curriculum in all areas. They have common assessments district wide.” What Linda wants to note as important to the theme is the progress that Rio School District has made. The use of personification gives

the argument a “fundamental image” of the progress. “A fundamental image is any familiar frame of reference, introduced early in a description, and then used as an outline, diagram or mould to locate all the details which follow” (Hughes & Duhamel, 1967, p. 249). “Rio School District has grown” is the frame of reference for describing the progress the district has made.

The way the district has grown is through expansion of curriculum and pedagogical resources. The use of relational processes expresses the growth of the district. In a relational process “something is said to ‘be’ in relationship with something else. In other words, “a relation is being set up between two separate entities” (Halliday, 1994, p. 119). A relational process can be expressed as a process of possession or attribution. The district as “they” has a “newly established curriculum in all areas” and “common assessments” attributed to it. The growth of the district is attributed to the possession of an expanded curriculum, common assessments, and aligned instruction among other initiatives.

After establishing that growth is important to the district, the message is that some do not accept the growth or change. Linda represents this contrasting reality through an existential clause: “there are still teachers that are kind of stuck in their old way of thinking.” A negative attribute of growth is introduced with “stuck.” Growth at times has not proceeded. The clause “that are kind of stuck” expands the meaning through contrast. Linda’s concern is expressed now as a desire to extend “growth” and preclude “stuckness” through the district mentors. Linda as legitimate decision maker uses a mental process clause of desire to express a proposal or demand. “But, I want them

[district mentors] to help us to get that [the new district instructional initiatives] off the ground.”

The new teacher mentoring program as designed and conceptualized does not meet the needs of the district. The mentoring program as practiced allows mentors and schools to make logistical decisions based on the concept of mentor as a nurturer and mother figure and locally decide on levels of commitment. Therefore, a new structural and conceptual design of the new teacher mentoring program will fit better with the new curriculum and instruction direction of Rio School District.

A commonality of approach is assumed about the design and concept of the mentoring program. The use of the pronoun “we” as in “we did a survey” and “we also met” and “we decided” designate others that are in agreement with Linda. Establishing a new teacher mentoring program could not happen without some sort of commonality of meaning. “The capacity to exercise social power ... includes the capacity to shape to some significant degree the nature and content of this ‘common ground’, which makes implicitness and assumptions an important issue with respect to ideology” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 55).

Linda uses the assumption that others are in agreement about changing the mentoring program to align more to the new district practices of curriculum and instruction as license to make the necessary changes. Linda and others – as denoted by the use of “we” – make a judgment or value assumption about what is good for the mentoring program. “So we decided that we needed more structure than that.” This value judgment is represented as a mental process of desire – an experience that is of a person’s

own consciousness. Mental processes such as “decide” are composed of a sensor – in this case “we” and the phenomenon (Halliday, 2004). In the case of “So we decided,” Linda and others are the sensors or the ones who made the decision. The decision itself is represented as a fact or a statement – a phenomenon – the content or idea thought about. In this case, the mental clause of desire, “So we decided” projects the other clause “that we needed more structure than that.” Linda creates the idea or content cognitively. “It is brought into existence by a process of thinking” (p. 449).

The import of the entire statement concerns the speech function of the idea “that we needed more structure than that.” A speech function is the designation of a clause as either a proposition or a proposal. Propositions are statements or exchanges of knowledge. Proposals are demands or requests (Halliday, 2004). Instead of being an exchange of information or a proposition, because the clause is the “idea” of a mental process of desire, it acts as a proposal. “... proposals, which are exchanges of goods-&-services [sic], are projected mentally by processes of desire ... Thus while propositions are thought, proposals are hoped” (Halliday, 2004, p. 461). It expresses what Linda and others want – a mentoring program conceptually and structurally designed to function in tandem with the curriculum and instructional changes in the district.

Linda’s agency is instrumental. Because she uses instrumental agency, she is making choices from the limitations of the possibilities imposed by her position as district director and from her past educational experiences. She reads the needs of the mentoring program and acts from non-consciousness. That is, she is unaware that her analysis and choice of mentoring program was conditioned by her practiced meanings of

mentoring and mentoring programs. As a result of her analysis of the mentoring program she chooses an organizational and conceptual design that closely fits with Her experiences and instructional belief system of the district. Since Linda wants changes in the mentoring program, she disguises this desire in a seemingly neutral observation about the process of decision making. “We did a survey of all the brand new teachers ... And we also met with the new teachers ... to receive feedback... And all of that data was analyzed and it was determined that there wasn’t any structure to it [the mentoring program].” Agency is hidden. By using “we” Linda includes herself but does not disclose the others who were involved in the decision. Who they are and their specific actions are not known. No one is credited with the analysis of the data. Other social actors besides Linda are hidden. “Which social actors get represented in which ways is a matter of social significance” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 222). Her instrumental agency as power is limited to the possibilities of actions as interpreted through her non-consciousness. She performs her legitimate duty of deciding on changes to the mentoring program from the limitations of possibility. She limits her own actions and subsequently limits the possibilities of actions of the mentors. This is an act of power. The design of the mentoring program will have repercussions as to the ways that the mentors choose to perform their mentoring tasks.

Surveillance

Structure as surveillance

Linda: And all of that data was analyzed and it was determined that there wasn't any structure to it.

So we decided that we needed more structure than that. And the way to do that was to put a person in a leadership role at the campus as a new teacher liaison. And the new teacher liaison is responsible for meeting with the mentors at the campus initially to train them for what the expectations are for them in the role as a mentor. And also to meet with new teachers on a monthly basis and make sure they are getting the support they need and to answer any questions that they might have and to share power point presentations ... We prepared these power point presentations to give to the campuses to do with the mentor teachers so that when they meet with them [new teachers] they would have something besides just feedback to talk about. It's actually a learning experience. Another thing we did is we kind of met with the mentors and I explained that I wanted to expand their role...

The district mentors and explained that based on the feedback I'd received I'd really like to expand their role to be more instructional. Not that the nurturing and the mothering is not important. It certainly is. But they [district mentors] need to also be that point person for instructional issues. Like, what are the expectations for aligning the curriculum? Where do I [new teacher] find this curriculum? How do I [new teacher] plan my lessons based on the curriculum? The district and state expectations. Things like that. So I've had key people coming in to meet with the [district] mentors to review different district wide initiatives that they need to be aware of in order to help the teachers.

The work the campus and district mentors do now is not aligned to the changes made in curriculum and instruction. Instead of locally determined decisions about the concept of mentoring and the commitment to mentoring, the mentoring program and the work of the mentors need to be brought under the watchful eye of the district.

Linda continues her story through explanation by definition. Description implies a comparison for contrastive characteristics while definition implies generating common characteristics to form a class or category (Rockas, 1967). Linda describes the

characteristics of the mentoring program relative to a conception of structure. The description was that of the lack of structure. Linda then begins defining the commonalities of a mentoring program with structure. “So we decided that we needed more structure than that.” After naming a new position – the campus new teacher liaison – she defines the very specific actions the campus new teacher liaison is responsible for accomplishing: “and the new teacher liaison is responsible for.” This is expressed in an attributional relational process. Being responsible is attributed to the position of campus new teacher liaison. Linda goes on to specify exactly what the responsibilities entail.

The new teacher campus liaisons are “to train them [the campus mentors]; “to meet with the new teachers on a monthly basis;” “[to] make sure they are getting the support they need;” “to answer any questions;” and, “to share power point presentations.” The use of the perfective or infinitive form of the verbs “train, meet, make sure, answer, and share” is known as the aspect of the verb. Aspect is “a category of the verb denoting primarily the relation of the action to the passage of time especially in reference to completion, duration, or repetition” (The American Heritage Dictionary, 1985, p. 133). The aspect characterized by the perfective or infinitive form “represents the potential, or virtual” or irrealis (Halliday, 2004, p. 425). This does not mean imaginary or unreal. It means the potential exists for “activities to be completed in the performance of the role” (p. 426). In Linda’s explanation, the activities to be completed are “to train, to meet, [to] make sure, to answer, and to share.”

The activities of the campus new teacher liaison are structured. The structure of the activities is further specified by prepositional phrases that more narrowly define

location, purpose, participants, and duration of these mentoring activities. The campus new teacher liaison is to meet with the mentors “at the campus” to train campus mentors “for what the expectations are for them in the role of mentor;” and, to meet “with new teachers on a monthly basis.”

Another way to specificity is through the use of relative clauses that expand upon meaning, “essentially to define, delimit or specify” (Halliday, 2004, p. 428). Examples include: “[to] make sure [that] they [new teachers] are getting the support [that] they need;” “to answer any questions that they [new teachers] might have;” and, “to share power point presentations that are pretty generic in fashion.” Support and answers are specified as what all new teachers need and what all campus new teacher liaisons should assure. The duties of the campus new teacher liaison are defined. Because they all are to perform these duties, they constitute a group classified as a kind of mentor doing specific activities.

Although the theme changes from “new teacher liaison” to “we,” Linda continues to define how structure will be added to the mentoring program by using the perfective aspect, specific limiting prepositional phrases, and embedded clauses. “We prepared these power point presentations to give to the campuses to do with the mentor teachers so that when they meet with them, they [campus mentors] would have something besides just feedback to talk about.”

The surveillance of the mentoring will be accomplished by inserting a new position on each campus – a position not commissioned by the campus but installed by the district. The power points, generalized for everyone’s use allows a dissemination of

district procedures and traditions and gives the mentors “something besides just feedback to talk about.” Mentors can observe how well the new teachers learn about the district.

“It’s [the use of the power points in meetings between the mentors and the new teachers] actually a learning experience.” The result of surveillance is a mentoring program with a defined structure: specifically prescribed meetings with formalized and generic agendas for the campus liaisons, mentors, and the new teachers.

Linda no longer represents her story as describing or defining. Linda now reports. The reporting is about the normalization of the district mentor roles. “I explained that I wanted to expand their [district mentors’] role.” “I explained” is a verbal process clause. Verbal processes are “symbolic relationships constructed in human consciousness and enacted in the form of language” (Halliday, 1994, p. 107). Just like mental process clauses, verbal process clauses can be used to project. The verbal clause “I explained” as a projection is about how Linda represents the second clause, “I want to expand their role.” This second clause tells about the content of her idea.

Verbal projection is a way of reporting. Reporting is not first hand accounting of direct speech but allows for summary – a way to give information from Linda’s point of view. What Linda reports is her desire to expand the district mentors’ role. Linda’s mental process of desire comes across as a proposal. Desire is construed as a mental process (Fairclough, 2003; Halliday, 1994, 2004). “Speech act values [propositions or proposals] cannot be assigned simply on the basis of formal features of an utterance; ... the assignment of speech act values is relative to situational context”(Fairclough, 2001a, p. 130). What Linda reports formats like a proposition, but acts like a proposal that is a

subtle request. It is like she is saying, “District mentors, I want to offer to you an expansion of your role.”

Training as surveillance

Linda continues the story by telling about district mentor training.

Linda: But they [the district mentors] need to be that point person for instructional issues ... So, I’ve had key people coming in to meet with the mentors to review different district wide initiatives that they need to be aware of in order to help the teachers.

Question: Did you do initial training at the beginning of the year?

Linda: For the new teachers?

Question: No, for the mentors.

Linda: We met to develop the mentor handbook.

Question: Okay, and I guess I’m saying district level at this point.

Linda: For the ... Oh yes, I’m sorry. Okay for the campus mentors.

Question: Okay, well yes, for both.

Linda: For both.

Question: I guess I’m asking training for either or both.

Linda: Yes and they [district and campus mentors] were both included. We offered I think two sessions in July that they would choose from to attend.

Question: And what was the nature of these sessions?

Linda: We had an outside consultant that had done this before come in and do it. And it was based on the importance of developing a relationship and understanding the phases of growth that new teachers go through and strategies for supporting new teachers in all areas of their job description.

Question: Are you going to have other training for the district level mentors and the campus mentors?

Linda: Okay. I meet with the district level mentors on a monthly basis. And there's a training component in every meeting. The campus mentors, they just have gone through the initial one-day. At this point, we haven't planned any additional training.

"Lexical cohesion comes about through the selection of items that are related in some way to those that have gone before" (Halliday, 2004, p. 570). Lexical cohesion is the tightness of patterns of word-to-word relationships. It elaborates and extends through the use of repetition, synonymy and hyponymy. Repetition of words is self-explanatory; synonymy is word choice involving synonymous relationships; hyponymy elaborates through attribution (Halliday, 2004).

Linda's word choice reflects the importance of meetings with the district mentors. Forms of the word "meet" appear: "key people coming in to meet with the mentors;" "we met to develop the mentor handbook;" "I meet with the district level mentors;" and, "there's a training component in every meeting." This is an example of repetition since the same word does not have to have the same "morphological shape" (Halliday, 2004, p. 572). Training becomes associated with meeting through an attributional relationship. Training is a kind of meeting: "and there's a training component in every meeting;" "the campus mentors, they just have gone through the initial one-day [training]; and "at this point we haven't planned any additional training."

Meeting for training especially for the district mentors has begun. Key district people, those in charge of the new curriculum and instructional initiatives have trained the district mentors. Now, monthly meetings will continue that training.

Staffing as surveillance

Linda describes one more action that she has taken to make structural changes to the mentoring program.

Linda: And me hiring Amanda was huge. She's not a retired teacher and she's very strong instructionally ... The others are retired teachers who, yes, they were great in their own classroom but from a more global standpoint Amanda having been an assistant principal, I think is just going to do wonders for the team."

Amanda: Well, my background kind of led me here. I was a teacher for seven years ... I finished my master's degree with midmanagement certification. And so I went into administration as a gifted and talented coordinator. And while I was working there, I worked with teachers in training all the time. And then, I missed the kids so I went back to the campus as an assistant principal. So, I've had some background there and I worked with new teachers of course in observations and everything as an assistant principal on a campus ... I have not received any official training for being a mentor from Rio School District, but I believed the reason they chose me for the position was because of my training and my background that I already had.

Linda acts by hiring a new district mentor, Amanda, as an addition to the district mentoring staff. She represents this through setting up a condition of opposites. The ways opposites can be represented is by the use of the conjunctions "but" and "and" and by relational processes of identity and attribution. "But" is a conjunction of expansion either as extension or enhancement (Halliday, 2004). Linda uses the conjunction "but:" "the others are retired teachers who, yes, they were great in their own classroom but from a more global standpoint Amanda having been an assistant principal..." The expansion is one of extension creating an adversative relationship such as: "On one hand there are retired teachers who ... On the other hand is Amanda."

Amanda uses "but" as concession or enhancement. "I have not received any official training for being a mentor from Rio School District, but I believed the reason

they chose me for the position was because of my training and my background.” The relationship could be expressed as: “I didn’t receive training here, nevertheless, my former training suffices.

This is emphasized by the relational processes that Linda uses. “She’s not a retired teacher and she’s very strong instructionally.” The use of not with the finite verb “is” constructs a meaning of it is not so. Retired teacher is not an attribute of Amanda. The second clause “she’s very strong instructionally” is an identifying relational clause. In identifying relational clauses the key to meaning is equal but not identical. The identified is equal, but not identical to the identifier. In this identifying relational clause, Amanda is a group of one who is equal to “very strong”. The use of the conjunction “and” as a positive elaboration connects the two clauses and makes possible by comparison the contrastive relationship: “It is not so that Amanda is a retired teacher and moreover Amanda is very strong. “Instructionally” serves the purpose of telling how Amanda is strong. The other relational clause, “The others are retired teachers is attributional. The attribution puts the carriers, “the others” into a group. The lexical repetition of “retired teachers” adds cohesion to the identifying clause about Amanda and the attributional clause about the retired teachers.

Comparison and contrast are concerned with similarities and dissimilarities in order to understand qualities or characteristics. However, the message is not that retired teachers are analogous to those who are not instructionally strong. Instead, the message is to represent the idea of partitioning Amanda off from the retired teachers. What Amanda is in the district mentoring group is different than who the retired teachers are.

As to difference, Amanda says about herself: “I finished my master’s degree with midmanagement certification. And so I went into administration as a gifted and talented coordinator. And while I was working there, I worked with teachers in training all the time ... so I went back to the campus as an assistant principal. So, I’ve had some background there and I worked with new teachers of course in observations and everything as an assistant principal on a campus.”

Linda validates Amanda’s difference because of Amanda’s assistant principal experience through the cognitive mental projection of “I think” across the proposition “but from a more global standpoint Amanda having been an assistant principal ... is just going to do wonders for the team.” “I think” represents some degree of doubt, but in the context, the doubt is skewed more to a positive outcome of Amanda influencing the team. Cast as different from the retired teachers, Amanda is expected to add her knowledge and experience to the meetings. That knowledge and experience is expected to be more in line with the mentoring program that Linda has established.

The on-going training of the district mentors, adding a district aligned position on the campuses, and bringing Amanda on board as a district mentor are structured as surveillance. There is an expectation of conformity to the structural mentoring program design changes. A part of expectations is suspense. Linda does not know how the district mentors and campus based liaison mentors will respond to the expectations of program changes.

A Monthly District Mentor Meeting

The following is a descriptive script of a monthly district mentor meeting. It is not a word for word transcript. Therefore, it has not been analyzed. The script is included as an example of a district mentor meeting.

October 30 notes on mentor meeting at Rio Public Schools

The district mentors meet monthly on the last Monday of the month. There were three mentors and the director of staff development present. Present at the meeting today was a professor from the local university and the researcher. We were seated in a conference room at the district offices. It was a fairly large room with an oval table. One door led out into the common hallway and another led into an office. Linda sat in a chair at the end of the table near the door to the hallway. This became the head of the table by virtue of her chairing and facilitating the meeting. To her left was Sheila, a mentor, Emily, a mentor, and Dr. Dora King, the professor. To Linda's right was the researcher, Amanda, a mentor, and Evelyn, a mentor. Other chairs at the end of the table remained vacant. The room was quiet except for a window rattle caused by the wind. The temperature was difficult to control and several times Linda had to adjust the thermostat. These environmental issues did not bother the participants except as side issues.

Linda began the meeting by having each person introduce themselves by name and role. Mentors introduced themselves and located themselves in the mentoring program by the level (high school, junior high, or elementary) and number of schools that they served. The mentors seemed at ease with each other and with Linda. They were not disturbed by the researcher's presence or the presence of Dr. King. Emily shared a story during her introduction. She asked a new teacher in an alternative school how he was doing. He had had no training for his position. Emily reported that he was calm. The administrator told Emily that it's hard for teachers to learn to de-escalate after incidences. Emily indicated that it was a different experience for her as a mentor to be in this classroom.

Sheila shared that she had been a mentor for four years and that she was trained in a reading program for teaching children with dyslexia. She shared that she had new teachers from 21 and 22 years old through 50 years old. She told about how some think they know it all since they were from families of teachers. They "know" how to teach so it must be the children they are teaching who are the problem. She continued to share that the principal was concerned about a teacher. Sheila added that this teacher had been moved from fourth grade to kindergarten.

This teacher may not have been at the new teacher meeting about discipline. Linda reminded that the presenter at that meeting was returning in January to meet with the new teachers and continue the training.

Dr. King shared the course that the district and the university are planning to offer to new teachers. It will be conceived as a constructivist course centered on the concerns that the new teachers bring. She hoped that it would bring resolution for some concerns and support for the new teachers. She also said she would be calling on the mentors and other teachers to help. The question of the course is what do the new teachers want to study further? It is also to encourage further graduate study by the new teachers. She quoted statistics that the state is far behind the other states in the number of teachers pursuing a higher degree. Nationally it is 41% and in the state it is 23%. Rio School District has 17% of its teachers with masters. The superintendent is also involved in the discussions of this course.

Amanda added that other states often paid for masters programs and that her home state did.

Dr. King said that the state is far behind others and she attributed this to a time when the state wanted to make teachers technicians. She described the reasons for this as trying to keep salaries lower.

Amanda thought that it was awesome to offer the course for free because it would be a hook to get the teachers back into school.

Dr. King and Linda had a logistical conversation arranging the dates of the course and decided to move it to Mondays. They also discussed the location of the course. Linda pointed out that the district had a policy of no meetings after school on Wednesdays. This was because this was the afternoon reserved for staff meetings. Another issue was avoiding sports in the afternoons. The decision was for Monday based on these considerations.

Dr. King pointed out that the world was changing and that universities are going to students.

Amanda stated that she began her master's work after her second year of teaching.

Dr. King said her hope was that the class would lead to ad hoc meetings and advice as to future studies for these new teachers.

Sheila stated that new teachers do not know how to teach reading. A local university offered courses in a nearby district that trained them. She pointed out that often the teachers were trained and left.

Dr. King said that at her university there were four courses in reading for elementary education majors and one for high school majors and that the students in that program should know how to teach. She went on to say that not every “promotional program” is presented in the courses. The program at her university was covering the basics. She said that a concern of hers would be what are they not getting from programs, which puts the burden on school districts.

Linda said that this concern about not being able to teach reading was at the superintendent’s cabinet awareness level. What has been talked about are the teachers talking about guided reading but not really using it, just using the jargon.

Dr. King stated that was why it was important for the districts and the university to work together. The university has knowledge and the district has needs. This course would be an experiment.

Linda explained that most of the strategies come from two reading methodologies and that both had good reading practices.

Amanda added that these practices were good to use with all kids.

Linda and others had a brief discussion on the staff development time for the new teachers and how that would be counted in the course credit. The time the new teachers spend with the mentors counts.

Dr. King said she sees this as a capstone kind of course. The university brings in readings – a more intensive understanding of what is happening with today’s students. The university is trying to find ways to connect with today’s students and make learning fun.

Dr. King left and Laura asked the mentors if they had had conversations about the district curriculum with their new teachers. What had come up in these conversations?

Amanda was concerned about team planning. She explained that one person on the team was doing math lesson plans and passing them out to all the others. The new teacher found that the lesson plans were not specific enough for her use. Amanda told her she needs to document the objective from the district curriculum so she knew what she was supposed to be covering. She continued that the new teacher was not on top of the totem pole to express her concerns. A brand new

teacher can't look at the district curriculum and know what to teach. They look at the plans but don't know what to do.

Sheila said she has new teachers who don't have materials for a phonics program. The other members of the team have the materials and are using them. The assistant principal, Sheila, and the new teacher talked and the new teacher was assured that she didn't have to do a program that she didn't have materials for. Sheila observed that she had seen more team leaders being unkind to new teachers.

Amanda remarked that the new teachers are not going to administrators because they don't want to ruffle feathers. She wasn't sure if they trusted her yet.

Emily said that it was different in secondary. Only one new teacher was concerned about the new curriculum. Some new teachers went 2 or 3 weeks without curriculum. She has seen objectives on the board, but doesn't hear teachers stating what they are. They are just the routines for the next few days. One teacher was just putting the objective number on the board. Emily told the teacher to explain what the lesson was and to use Bloom's taxonomy. Sheila said that a few were reteaching and she assured them this was fine.

Evelyn added that historically it was better instruction at the elementary level because they were following lesson design – what the state teacher evaluation system is based on.

Emily added that the English departments were strong on goals and accomplishment.

Evelyn stated that was because they don't want the students to read the same literature from year to year and that leads to better planning.

Emily said that coaches were teaching p.e. One school does it different from other schools as to scheduling. (Middle school concept, block scheduling.) It was hard for the teachers to figure out if "I accomplished what the district wants."

Emily and Amanda said that the new teachers were aware that the kids were constantly being tested.

Linda reminded them that at the new teacher meeting in December, they would have a presentation on a gradual release model from ESL. It is good instruction and applies to everybody.

Amanda had an observation tool to share. She said she just developed it in response to new teacher concerns, particularly in response to when the administrator comes in and makes comments about management. The new teachers had questions about what they needed to know. Amanda said she had used it three times. With two of the teachers, she felt it was useful and they liked it. The third teachers didn't like the feedback. The observation tool is a checklist and has a place to check if the teacher response is positive reinforcement or negative reinforcement. She stated that it was objective, and was about what the teacher said and what the teacher did. There was a place for comments. The new teacher argued with her about the comments. Amanda conferenced with the teacher and gave suggestions. She will go back and use the instrument again. As she observes, she removes herself and her opinions from the observation although she wants to jump up in the observation and say things.

Emily shared a story about observing a teacher by invitation. The teacher was concerned because her class would come in, take their seats, but not get directly to work with the work she had assigned via the board. Her concern was based in that her other classes came in and went right to work. The mentor suggested that the nature of this class was different and that she would have to tell them what to do. Emily added that the forms were good for teachers to see what they were doing.

Evelyn shared a story about a dual language teacher who was the only dual language kindergarten teacher at the school. She was having classroom management difficulties. Police officers were talking to the other dual language classes and would talk also to this dual language class. She and the rest of the mentors were somewhat taken aback by the idea of police officers talking to these children and especially the kindergarten students. Evelyn asked Linda if it would be okay for her to arrange for the teacher to observe in another school's dual language class and she would cover the class.

Emily told about a conflict in the p.e. department between the new teacher and the veteran teacher. Emily is working through this with the teachers and the principal.

Several of the mentors talked about new teachers not wanting to observe experienced teachers. They said the reasons new teachers gave were that they did enough observation during their college courses and they wouldn't learn anything from observing an experienced teacher. The meeting was adjourned.

Positionality

Self-positioning: Amanda

Amanda: Well, my background kind of led me here. I was a teacher for seven years ... I finished my master's degree with midmanagement certification. And so I went into administration as a gifted and talented coordinator. And while I was working there, I worked with teachers in training all the time. And then, I missed the kids so I went back to the campus as an assistant principal. So, I've had some background there and I worked with new teachers of course in observations and everything as an assistant principal on a campus.

Question: When you came to the district, what kind of training did you receive for being a mentor?

Amanda: I have not received any official training for being a mentor from the district. But I believe that the reason they chose me for the position was because of my training and background that I already had. I am trained to do teacher evaluations by the state ... and all the observations. ... I mean I already had that training so it wasn't necessary to give me that training.

The theme of the first passage is "background." From that theme, Amanda explains how the two different educational leadership positions qualify her to be a district mentor in Rio School District. After the initial theme of background, Amanda switches to the theme of "I." The "I" themes and the material process clauses elaborate on her personal experience: "I finished my master's degree with midmanagement certification;" "I went into administration;" and, "I worked with new teachers." The prepositional phrases "with midmanagement certification," "into administration," and "with new teachers" specify the circumstances of her previous experiences as foundational for the job of district mentor. Amanda represents her qualifications with sequentially narrated propositions.

In the second passage, Amanda uses a mental process clause as projection. “But I believed” expresses her thought about the proposition “that the reason they chose me for the position was because of my training and my background that I already had.” “I believed” is a cognitive mental process of modality. Modality concerns the likelihood or probability of occurrence. “Modality represents the speaker’s angle ... the validity of the assertion” (Halliday, 2004, p. 624). The point is not that her experiences were not a determinant in her district mentor position, but that she believes they were. Whether district and campus experiences are indeed determinants for the job of district mentor can be argued through reference to other sources. What cannot be argued is that Amanda believes that it is so.

In the second passage, Amanda specifies the training she has had: “I am trained to do teacher evaluations by the state.” By using the perfect aspect or infinitive, “to do, ” Amanda represents the potential for using her past training as a district mentor as a context from which to qualify the lack of need for district training. Amanda says, “I mean I already had that training [state training] so it wasn’t necessary to give me that training [district mentor training].” She clarifies her position of sufficiency with the verbal process clause “I mean.”

Amanda positions herself within the mentoring program. Her bureaucratic position is as a member of the district mentor group. Her experiences as related to observing and training teachers are part of the discourse that pertains to her mentor role as part of her subject positionality. Through her expressed belief of the importance of her experiences to her role as district mentor, Amanda aligns her structural and subject

positionalities. Amanda assumes a positionality that is useful to the district as a resource for changing the mentoring program because of her experiences.

Self-positioning: Kerry

Kerry is both the campus new teacher liaison and the campus mentor. She tells about the way she became both. She refers to herself as the “campus level mentor.”

Kerry: The district level requested a campus level mentor and it ... usually most of the campus mentors are [assistant principals]. But because I’m working on my practicum [for midmanagement certification], we felt this would be a good participation for my practicum. I’ve been a mentor before. At my old school, I would say about seven years ago, I had been a mentor. Then the first year, about six years ago when I first came here because we had teachers on the campuses be mentors of new teachers and each of us was paired up with someone.

I was paired with the art teacher because there was no other art teacher. But we had teacher mentors for the new people. But the district has revamped what they’re doing so we don’t have teachers mentoring new teachers. What they have is a district level mentor. There are three retired teachers that are to come in and check on all the new teachers. They work directly with them. ... And the campus based mentor was mostly to be a resource as to how things work on your campuses. What my impression is.

The theme of the first sentence is “the district level.” The whole clause, “The district level requested a campus level mentor” is a proposal. Kerry reports on the district’s request. That request is a demand. What is wanted is a response from the school in the way of an action – placing a person in the job of campus level mentor [new teacher liaison]. The response to a request is always discretionary on the part of a responder and could be compliance or refusal. In this case, the response on the part of the campus is a refusal to act exactly as requested: “usually most of the campus mentors are [assistant principals].” Kerry then explains by using comparison and contrast why the campus did not exactly comply with the request.

The circumstantial theme “ But because I’m working on my practicum [for midmanagement certification]” sets up a contrast or difference between what the district requested and what actually occurs. The conjunction “but” signals the contradiction meaning “on the other hand”. The clause of reason or explanation begins with “because” and signals the answer to the question of why the campus has done differently than what the district requested. “... we felt this would be a good participation for my practicum [for midmanagement certification]” is a mental clause of projection. However, it is different from the cognitive mental projection clause and desirative mental projection clause above from Amanda and Linda respectively: “I believed” and “I want.” “We felt” is a mental projection clause of sensing. In this case it is different because as perception, it is more a desired thought (Halliday, 2004). What is projected is a fact: “... [that] this would be a good participation for my practicum.” “We” is Kerry and her principal, Ilsa. Both Kerry and Ilsa in their thinking want it to be so that Kerry is the campus liaison/mentor.

After explaining why the campus made their decision, Kerry becomes the theme – “I”. Through the predominant use of relational attribution clauses Kerry identifies herself as a mentor in the past. Through “I’ve been a mentor before” and “I had been a mentor then the first year about 6 years ago,” Kerry places herself into a group or class named “mentor.” She was positioned at these two distinct times as a mentor; in another school and in her present school.

In the second passage, Kerry wants to establish that changes in the way mentoring is done in Rio School District have effected her position as a mentor. She explains the

reason she had been a mentor on her present campus: “because we had teachers on the campuses be mentors of new teachers.” She then explains about the changes in the mentoring program. The meaning of the two clauses “The district has revamped...” and “we don’t have teachers mentoring new teachers” is expanded by the conjunctions “but” and “so.” “But” implies a replacive extension (Halliday, 2004, p. 422) meaning instead of. “So” implies an enhancement of both temporality and cause. “But” used as “instead of” means that the district changed the structure of the mentoring program. “So” as meaning “and then” connects the past mentoring program with the present one.

Kerry continues to contrast the work of the district mentor and the campus-based mentor. She does this first by presenting the contrast as an impression: “ [that is] what my impression is.” Impression is a nominalization of a mental process expressed as a verb, “impress.” Impression is a thing or entity that belongs to Kerry. “Impression” is in the realm of opinion or viewpoint. The impression Kerry has about the work of the campus-based mentors may or may not be correct. This is not a mental projection; the clause of projection is not differentiated from that of the idea. Kerry does not say, “I think or feel or assume or suspect that the campus-based mentor was mostly to be a resource as to how things work on your campuses.” Posed as a projection noun – impression – Kerry’s assertion can be argued. She claims her impression, but leaves a doubt as to her commitment to the impression.

Second, she uses the perfectives “to come in,” “to check,” and “to be” to represent irrealis or the possibility that the work of the district and campus based mentors might take a different turn. The district level mentors are “to come in and [to] check on all the

new teachers.” “And the campus-based mentor was [is] mostly to be a resource as to how things work on your campuses” Taken together, the statement of impression and the placement of the specific actions into a future of uncertainty presents Kerry as aware that her way of doing mentoring is challenged.

Kerry’s bureaucratic position is named. She is a member of the group called campus new teacher liaisons/campus mentors. What is challenged is the cultural or traditional structural positionality of campus mentor. Kerry presents her historical experiences as significations of beliefs about mentoring as a locally determined activity. In this way, she aligns herself with the traditional structural positionality of campus mentors. Although she is supposed to act in accord to her assigned place in the hierarchy, tradition and habit override.

Positioning of Others: Differentiation

Positionality is not confined to self-positioning. Individuals position each other. Amanda and Kerry position each other within the district mentoring program. Both Amanda and Kerry tell a story about becoming a mentor in Rio School District and Lundgren Elementary respectively. Both are examples of what Miller (2005) calls a teacher story. “ ‘Teachers’ stories’ often offer unproblematized recountings of what is taken to be the transparent, linear, and authoritative ‘reality’ of those teachers’ ‘experiences’ ” (p. 51). It is a criss-cross situation. The reality of Amanda’s story about Kerry’ positionality becomes her interpretive discourse. The reality of Kerry’s story about Amanda likewise determines how she interprets Amanda’s positionality. From her own positionality, each creates a positional reality about the other.

How Amanda positions Kerry

Question: Do you work with the campus-based mentor at all?

Amanda: No, I really don't. I mean I won't say no I don't work with her at all. I'm available to them [campus mentors] if they have an issue or they want to discuss something with me. But, my primary job is to work with the new teacher. I am an additional step. They [new teachers] have their campus mentor and then they also have me. I'm more of an advocate for the teacher. I'm looking for positive things. I'm looking for what they're doing right. I'm there to give them feedback if there are things that are happening that they need constructive feedback with... But that's not really my role. My role is to kind of be almost a cheerleader for these teachers. So they [new teachers] have their campus mentor and then they have their campus administration for all the other stuff. My role is to come in and pump them up and let them know what they are doing right.

Amanda begins her justification for not working with the campus mentors with the conjunction "but" meaning "nevertheless." The theme of the sentence is "my primary job" followed by the perfective "to work." In the sentence, the possibilities of the future work with the new teachers are identified as Amanda's job in contrast with working with the campus mentors. She follows with more relational processes of identity expressed as metaphors to specify her job: "I am an additional step;" "I'm more of an advocate;" and, "my role is to kind of be almost a cheerleader." She continues using metaphors with the perfectives "to come in and [to] pump them up."

"Advocate" is a nominalization. "An additional step" and "a cheerleader" are also nominalizations as metaphors. Within the contrastive context of the passage, these propositions suggest that the role of the campus mentor is other than what Amanda's role is. Amanda does not say that campus mentors are not advocates, but she implies that their main job is not advocacy. She does not say that the campus mentors do not do enough for the new teachers, but she makes an assumption about the needs of the new teacher within

the campus mentor relationship. She does not say that campus mentors do not give support through positive feedback, but implies that she should not be expected to address negative things the new teachers might do. “I’m looking for positive things.” “I’m looking for what they’re [new teachers] doing right.” A contrast is set up by the conjunction “but.” “I’m there to give them feedback if there are things that are happening that they need constructive feedback with. I can do that, but that’s not really my role.”

To conclude, Amanda says, “So, they [new teachers] have their campus mentor and then they have their campus administration for all the other stuff.” “So” as a causal conjunction (Halliday, 2004) enhances the contrast she makes between her job and that of the campus mentor. Specifically, Amanda is an advocate, an additional step, and a cheerleader of sorts. She looks for the good and the positive in the new teachers. It is not that the campus mentor may not be or do any of the above. Instead, Amanda circumscribes a perimeter around her own role identity or positionality thereby creating for herself a reality of the campus mentor as one who is and acts other than herself. She positions the campus mentor as a member of a group whose role is different than her own.

How Kerry positions Amanda

Kerry differentiates her role from Amanda as to availability to the new teachers. Availability concerns both time and place.

Kerry: And the [new] teachers had the district level mentor but the district level mentor would just pop in whenever. It wasn’t a planned thing. A lot of times we were on our planning time as a team so she didn’t get much time with the teacher or the teacher had to leave our meeting that was planning to meet with this other person. So it was kind of a touch and go thing. I don’t think the new teacher felt

much support in that area. I felt we were more effective when we had teachers mentoring other teachers on the campus And I guess the reasoning for that is when you work on that campus you know what your principal expects versus when you have someone from outside. They can't answer a lot of questions for you because they don't know ... what your campus, your principal expects."

And even now, having that outside person coming in, the new teachers don't know when she's coming from what they've told me. It's kind of a fly in and fly out."

You mean like having the district level mentor that we're not even sure when she's going to come? I just don't think that's effective.

And I'm not saying that they [district mentors] don't want to deal with these new teachers. But, they come in for 30 minutes and they don't show up for two more weeks. There's so much I do on a daily basis with some of these teachers. I sat down and planned for two hours with one girl on science lesson plans that the district mentor...there's no way she would spend that much time with [the teacher].

I've gone in and observed one teacher because of the discipline. But, it's going to take more than one observation and that's why I think you need someone on the campus. If there's a problem you can go right to them [campus mentor] and they are there. And maybe if that's the case, they [new teachers] can call those people [district mentors]. But I don't know if they have built a relationship with that district mentor either. They know me. They see me. They see me every day and they know to ask for help. Where I don't know if they [new teachers] even know what schedule [district mentor's schedule]. So how do they [new teachers] know when to have questions or not?

Like I said before, that was what would happen and she would show up on the planning days and as a teacher you know what you've got to get done in that 45 minute period. And then she would show up. No time to talk. How are things going? Things are going well.

Time and place are the comparative issues that Kerry uses in describing the difference between the district and campus mentor roles. This is expressed through lexical cohesion (Halliday, 2004) as the word chains associate around scheduling and duration of time and physical placement for availability. Scheduling predominates in the

lexical groups “just pop in whenever;” “it wasn’t a planned thing;” “so it was kind of just a touch and go thing;” “when she’s coming;” “kind of a fly in and fly out;” “that we’re not even sure when she’s going to come?”; “they don’t show up for two more weeks;” and, “she would show up.” Each group of words indicates that scheduling by the district mentor was unpredictable.

Besides scheduling, the amount of time the district mentor was able to spend with the new teachers figures in Kerry’s description: “so she [district mentor] didn’t get much time with the teacher;” “there’s no way she would spend that much time with [the teacher] ;” and, “no time to talk.” All indicate that the district mentor could not spend enough time with the new teachers.

Kerry’s third concern about the role of the district mentor is the most important in her positioning of Amanda. Kerry’s presence allows her to have immediate knowledge of new teacher needs. Kerry can answer new teacher questions from the context of the local campus. She positions Amanda as not being able to relate to the local day-to-day needs of the new teachers: “and I guess the reasoning for that is when you have someone from outside, they can’t answer a lot of questions for you;” “having that outside person come in;” and, “but it’s going to take more than one observation and that’s why I think you need someone on the campus” The non-availability of the district mentor is Kerry’s main concern.

Kerry continues to argue her concern by tying presence with commitment. “I don’t think the new teacher felt much support in that area [irregularity of district mentor visits]. I felt we were more effective when we had teachers mentoring other teachers on

the campus.” “You mean like having the district level mentor that we’re not even sure when she’s going to come? I just don’t think that’s effective.” “But it’s going to take more than one observation [of a new teacher] and that’s why I think you need someone on the campus.”

In all three clauses, mental processes are projected. Her level or degree of commitment is expressed first and then the idea or subject of her commitment is expressed. “I don’t think” and “I think” are cognitive mental processes of median probability. “I don’t think” is called a transferred negative and does not affect the modality of median probability (Halliday, 2004). That is, Kerry’s judgment is that she holds probable that new teachers didn’t get support because of the random scheduling of the district mentor’s visits. Therefore, someone is needed on the campus. Kerry’s structural and subject positionality are more aligned with the campus. Kerry is most probably committed to the localness of mentoring that provides immediate and intensive time and presence.

The textual use of polarity and adversative conjunction express the contrast between Kerry’s positionality and that of the district mentor. “Polarity is the opposition between positive and negative” (Halliday, 2004, p. 143). The adversative conjunction “but” connects text so that difference is highlighted. “But, they come in for 30 minutes and they don’t show up for two more weeks. There’s so much I do on a daily basis with some of these teachers. That district mentor there’s no way she would spend that much time.” The context of this is an analogy Kerry makes between the p.e. teacher who sees students briefly once every week and the district mentor who comes in briefly every two

weeks. The p.e. teacher doesn't have to deal daily with problems. Kerry clarifies that it is not the case that the district mentor doesn't want to deal with problems. However, her absence leaves problems unanswered or leaves others to deal with them.

The contrast is emphasized by lexical cohesion. Kerry positions the district mentor as not having affinity with the local school and the day-to-day needs of the new teachers. For Kerry the district mentors' positionality is both structurally and subjectively outside of the local school. Kerry emphasizes this when twice she refers to the district mentor as "someone from the outside" and "having the outside person come in."

Kerry evaluates the effectiveness of the district mentor position. She does not evaluate Amanda or any other district mentor, just the way the position is used by the district. "You know, it's not anything against that mentor either." Kerry's evaluation or judgment of effectiveness comes from her sense of affiliation. Affiliation refers to the connection between the mentor, her physical location, and her interpretation and response to the needs of the new teachers. It is commitment and this commitment is expressed textually through modality or "the speaker's judgement of the probabilities, or the obligations, involved in what he is saying. A proposition may become arguable by being presented as likely or unlikely, desirable or undesirable" (Halliday, 1994, p. 75). What a person is committed to is important to "how they identify themselves ... what you commit yourself to is a significant part of what you are – so modality choices in texts can be seen as part of the process of texturing self-identity" (Fairclough, 2003, p. 164; 166). In Kerry's thoughts, the allegiance and commitment of the district mentor are questioned.

Amanda's allegiance as district mentor is not to the school and her commitment is not to the immediate local needs of the new teachers.

Agency

Agency is a way of being in action. Amanda and Kerry's ways of being in action as they work with new teachers is instrumental agency. They both analyze the needs of a situation and then choose the actions to use. The analysis of situations rests on consideration of their structural and subject positionalities as a totality of knowledge needed. From the frame of her mentor experience and from her place as a mentor on the campus, Kerry analyzes what she needs to do. Amanda analyzes what she needs to do from her leadership roles and instructional observation training and from her place as a mentor for the district. They analyze from a frame of "truth" that rationalizes the appropriateness of their actions. They do not ask questions about their experiences or mentoring positions that would change the focus and intent of their analyses. They do not analyze from the "partial" (Ellsworth, 1994, p. 306), the recognition that their frame is limited and represents individual self interest. They do not consider "working difference" (Ellsworth & Miller, 1996, p. 246) as a contestation of the totality of their positionalities as a frame. They do not act as cyborgs (Haraway, 1997, p. 51). Their agency is configured only from the rational arguments of these individualized "truths."

The campus mentor acts: Kerry

Kerry has concerns about the district mentor role. Kerry responds to a question about reasons she might have for not expressing her concern about the district mentor position. Ilsa, as principal, also responds to the same question.

Kerry: I mean if they [others in the mentoring program] asked, I guess I would tell them my feeling and what I see on the campus level as a concern.”

Question: You would not hesitate?

Kerry: I wouldn't have trouble because that's what's going to help new teachers. If we don't let them know what we see as a concern. But I guess the opportunity hasn't presented itself.

Question: The problem ... not working with the district mentor. Is there an opportunity for you to express that problem?

Ilsa: If I wanted to get on the phone and do it I probably could, but they've [district] not asked me. But, I could.

Kerry says, “I would tell them my feeling and what I see on the campus level as a concern” and “the opportunity hasn't presented itself.” Although in these propositions, Kerry states her willingness to communicate about the district mentor position, mental projections inject uncertainty. Kerry shows her uncertainty by “I guess.” The first use of “I guess” establishes an uncertainty about letting the district know her feelings. Coupled with the conjunction “but,” as “nevertheless” the second use of “I guess” expresses her uncertainty about the opportunity for telling the district her concern. It is not clear if she has missed an opportunity or has not been afforded an opportunity of expression. Whichever way, she has not said what is on her mind.

Ilsa uses “probably” as an adverb expressing a median degree of likelihood that she is able to talk to the district (Halliday, 2004). She follows with the conjunction “but” meaning on the other hand. Ilsa could call the district. On the other hand, they haven't asked her so she won't. The importance is not the motivation for the choice of non-action by either Kerry or Ilsa. The importance is choosing as an action a non-action.

The non-action is an acceptance of Kerry's role as campus mentor that is supported at the campus level by Ilsa. It is almost as if neither one thinks it would do any good to complain about the district level mentor position. Not complaining does not call attention to what Kerry does on the campus. Ilsa acts as buffer between Kerry and the district while Kerry goes about her role as mentor.

Kerry tells the story about working with the new teachers at the beginning of the year.

Kerry: It wasn't that this year that Ilsa didn't go through it [the campus handbook]. Our building was under construction. And so we were all packed into the little trailer and trying to make the best of it that we could with what we had. We spent half the day going over the main points. I think it needs to be a lot of work on your campus just to understand how things are going. Because that's the problem they had the first two weeks of school is how to learn the procedures of the campus so that I'm functioning like everybody else is functioning.

Well Monday we met with them and talked about report cards and expectations for report cards; how things that should be turned in. That seems like that's trivial, but those are the things, those are the workings of schools.

Kerry begins by narrating a story of how she and her principal, Ilsa, worked with the new teachers at the first of the year. The clauses "It wasn't that this year you know that Ilsa didn't go through it" and "Our building was under construction" establish the setting of her tale. She then uses material process clauses to physically locate herself and others in the story: "we were all packed" and "we spent." Kerry defines the story problem by speaking for the new teachers: "because that's the problem they had the first two weeks of school; how to learn the procedures of the campus so that I'm functioning like everybody else is functioning." Kerry as the author of this story defines the problem of the story – learning the ropes. The cognitive mental projection, "I think" presents the

proposition “it needs to be a lot of work on your campus just to understand how things are going” and offers the solution to the problem as situated on the campus. In the second passage, Kerry elaborates on how the problem of learning the workings of the campus was solved. Material process clauses “we met” and “talked” again physically place Kerry and the others at the school.

Kerry then talks about working with the new teachers on report cards as an example of the local needs of the new teachers. Kerry uses “that” in “that’s trivial” as a lexical cohesive element referring back to report card and expectations of report cards. She attributes trivialness to the issue of report cards. However, she uses the relational verb “seems” which attributes an appearance at a certain time (Halliday, 2004). The conjunctive “but” as nevertheless sets up the contrast with the next clause “those are the workings of the schools.” In this clause, lexical cohesiveness is the reference to “report cards and expectation of report cards” by “those.” An identifying relational clause is “are the workings of schools.” Therefore, report cards and expectations for report cards are not trivial; they are what go on in a school.

Kerry identifies with the necessity of the importance of keeping things local. She states the problem: new teachers need to know what happens in their school. She analyzes the problem and chooses the actions needed to solve the problem. She elaborates on the solution to the problem. Then she evaluates the success of her actions through speaking for the new teachers. “At least they’ve got a clear understanding of that [the report card issues].”

Kerry: I guess using what I got from the district, the power point as a guide. I guess to me my part is putting in things as examples of what I've done with my classrooms.

So I'm trying to give them things that I've done or things that I've tried in addition to what the district has given me to share with them.

My experience ... I guess I'm helping them knowing what I know from my principal.

She [Ilsa] has those procedures in place. And that's what she wants you to follow. So I'm going to reiterate that. Because what the district and that the power point had on it may not be specific enough for our [school].

Probably extending [the information on the power points]. They [new teachers] have general ideas of what needs to be done and then that allows for me to get more specific on what we do at our school. And our school may do it completely different than another school.

In the first three passages, the importance is Kerry and what she has done as the campus liaison/mentor. She focuses on herself as the take-off point of each of the clauses by using themes such as "I" or "my part" or "my experience." What follows are the material processes of "is putting," "trying to give," and "am helping." The process of "trying to give" is the irrealis expression of intention. In other words, Kerry has the intention of giving them examples from her experience. "I am helping" and "is putting" are realis expressions of present and ongoing actions. Both the realis and irrealis expressions are concerned with "stages of becoming. A process is something that emerges out of imagination into reality ... as future turns into present, imagination turns into reality" (Halliday, 2004, p. 501). These material processes are Kerry's in the performance of her mentor role.

In the last two passages, Kerry is the mediator between Ilsa's expectations for new teachers and the district's support of these expectations. The school has certain local ways of doing things expressed through "She [Ilsa] has those procedures in place." This possessive relational clause gives ownership to Ilsa as representative of the school. The procedures are anaphorically referenced in the next clause by "that" and "what." Kerry's action as mediator is "going to reiterate." In this example, the process that is extended from the present into the future is not material but verbal. "Because" is a causal conjunction that Kerry uses to explain her reason for "reiterating." She does that with the modal and polar "may not." "May" sets up the possibility or likelihood and "not" expresses that possibility as negative.

Kerry sees her role as campus liaison/mentor as reinterpreting the more global district desires for new teachers into the local context of the school. She filters what the district wants through her experiences with Ilsa's expectations. Kerry's acts as mentor are congruent with her physical location and her past experiences. Although she acts in accordance to district expectations for the campus liaison/mentor, she uses experiences specific to her location to elaborate her mentoring.

A Campus Mentor New Teacher Training

The following is an observational script of a new teacher training given by Kerry. It is not a transcript and therefore is not analyzed. It is a session about one of the district power points on "Discipline – Difficult Students." It is presented here as an example of Kerry at work as campus mentor.

October 2 observation script of new teacher training by Kerry

The four new teachers gathered around a table in Kerry's classroom to view a district provided power point on Discipline – Difficult Students. Kerry introduced the power point by reminding the group that these students take the state test. One of the new teachers asked if this was about special education. Another expressed her confusion over the letters ED. She said she has seen them used as emotionally disturbed and educationally disadvantaged and wanted to know how do you know the difference when you see the letters in text. Kerry remarked that Lundgren does not have many emotionally disturbed kids. Another new teacher asked if the state test was what they were talking about with test scores. The new teachers shared stories of difficult students. Connie said she had a student like that in student teaching. Felicity said that the kids at Lundgren weren't that bad. Connie said we have talking and kids need a break and need to get out of their chairs. She related this to an in-service on discipline that they had had.

Kerry gave advice to not give in to these kids. Connie told a story about a child she did not give in to. Kerry pointed out that power struggles happen. Felicity said that if you lose control, you're lost.

Kerry said that some behavior problems are lack of opportunity for some kids to develop academic skills. Felicity stated that what they really want is attention. Kerry agreed.

The group moved on through the slides with the new teachers reading them silently to themselves.

Frances asked in reference to a slide what did it mean by insensitive to errors? Kerry responded that the kids don't see the errors. Kerry referred to what her principal had said on grade level planning day about changing a kid's schedule. Think about the kids who need structure and routine.

Felicity told a story about kids who needed to "walk on the track". Theresa related this to college experiences in class of having to pay attention for the duration of the class. Felicity observed that they had all dealt with these kids.

Kerry responded that these kids should be sent to the office and the parents should be in on it. Connie responded that she didn't think she had ever seen this. Felicity said she had one in her class and that the child went out of its way to do the opposite. Kerry responded with a story about an oppositional child who would listen to her.

Kerry stated when explaining a slide that ADD kids don't have control. Connie told a story about her kindergarten class. Felicity talked about a sweet boy who can't control himself. Kerry advised to look at the official written intervention plans and make sure there's consistency and consequences.

Theresa asked what if the kids grew up with ADD. Felicity said that some think it's a mental disorder. Kerry said that in her human growth and development class they talked about the number of high school kids who commit suicide. Frances talked about a self-esteem unit in elementary school. Theresa said they need medication. Frances told about her brother being on medication. Felicity said it depends on the medication. Frances continued her story about her brother and medication. Kerry advised that if they suspected this go to the counselor. She also talked about a technique of sending ADD kids between teachers with a note.

Theresa asked how much depression is bipolar. Frances talked about conduct disorder. Felicity commented that these kids would come after you. Kerry again reminded for them to go to the counselor. Kerry continued to advise that if the kids see you've lost control and power that she suggested have the kids call home. She suggested giving privileges instead of reward and that sometimes kids haven't had an opportunity to learn. They've missed out on curriculum and that's why our curriculum is aligned.

Theresa said that their attendance is poor so how can they learn.

Frances told a story about a kid with traumatic brain injury.

Kerry explained to work with their teams. She related that the principal doesn't care for the kids being out in the hall. The kids aren't working when they are there.

Frances said that if the kids were working in a group and making rude remarks they don't deserve to be in a group. Kerry suggested to Frances that she and he make a group and talk to him alone. Felicity suggested putting the kid in the back of room to write his own assignment. Theresa said she would never put them out of the room. Felicity said she would put him in the back of the room. Kids don't want to be out of the loop.

Kerry gave the group a sample behavior chart that she had gotten from training on differentiation. She talked about problem solving individually and that some kids need to learn differently. She related it to kids not putting names on papers by saying just walk by. Felicity talked about moving kids around the room for different lessons. Kerry reminded to look for small things – "catch them being good."

Kerry explained how to use the chart as a tool. Felicity said it would be hard for a teacher to keep up with this. Connie said she didn't know what to do with a mean student that was lying and making rude faces. Theresa wanted to know how to nip problems in the bud. Felicity wanted to know about effective things to say. Kerry advised to be respectful and let the kids taste success and figure out who was getting the class riled up. Felicity said to talk to another teacher about behavior problem. She said that if kids like the subject, they would work hard. Kerry reminded them to build relationships by showing interest and they won't disappoint you. The minute you're not prepared, kids know. She suggested a roll of tickets to hand out, contests, and drawing from the treasure box. Felicity suggested a "2 finger clap" when you catch them doing something good.

Kerry said that at college they were taught to ask please do this, but in practice just tell them.

Agency Continued

The district mentor acts: Amanda

Amanda extends on how she sees herself as she performs her role as district mentor.

Amanda: I pretty much do whatever that teacher needs me to do. Like I said earlier, sometimes I feel like I'm their mom. Sometimes I feel like I'm their best friend. Sometimes I feel like I'm a counselor. Sometimes I feel like I'm an administrator to them.

Amanda describes the indeterminate nature of her job by adding modality or the likelihood of usuality (Halliday, 2004) to the verb "do." "Pretty much" is used to mean that it's somewhat usual for her to do what the new teachers want. The goal or the object of the clause is "whatever." "I pretty much do whatever." The nature of her job is extended by specifying on "whatever" with "that teacher needs me to do." She then describes her job by proposing through relational identity clauses her identity as "mom,

best friend, counselor, and administrator.” A series of mental projections of perception, “I feel” separate the statements about her many identifications from her perception.

Perception is used to refer to object-oriented experience. Perception pertains to the stoppage and stasis-tending dimension of reality associated with the production of possibilities. Perception is segmenting and capable of precision. Perception enables quantification and is exoreferential” (Massumi, p. 258).

Each role description – mom, best friend, counselor, and administrator – is discretely identified from the other in Amanda’s perception. The meaning of mentoring for Amanda is more extensive than that which the district wants. She is not bound by the priority of a role of instructional support as designated by the district. She extends the meaning through the use of the preposition “like.” She thinks or perceives of herself as like a mom, best friend, counselor, and administrator. She identifies with all of the roles.

Amanda: Classroom teachers who are mentors to new teachers they have a huge job. I mean they have a full time classroom teaching position plus they’re expected to kind of coach and bring along a brand new classroom teacher who may or may not need a whole lot of work. I mean they’re [new teachers] all different. They walk through the door and they’re all so different. When you ask a classroom teacher to mentor a new teacher, you’re not really sure what you’re asking them to do because you’re not really sure how needy that teacher [new teacher] is going to be. I think the new teachers are very fortunate to have an additional person. It helps the campus mentor and it helps that new classroom teacher because they don’t always have that teacher [who] has a classroom going on. And I can come in and they have access to me pretty much whenever they want. ... I’m out there trying to find out how to help them in whatever they need.

Throughout the passage, Amanda justifies the role of district mentor by comparison of availability of the campus mentor who can be a classroom teacher to her own availability. She characterizes the classroom teacher/mentors through relational possessive processes as having “a huge job.” She then uses a synonymous lexical

relationship between “a huge job” and “a full time classroom teaching position” and “bring along a brand new classroom teacher.”

The theme then changes and focuses on the characteristic need differences of new teachers. Relational attribute clauses with lexical repetition emphasize this point. “I mean they’re all different. They walk through the door and they’re all different.” Amanda expresses the specific differences between new teachers through a hyponomous relationship of “different” and “needy.” Hyponomous relationships of attribution are “based on classification” (Halliday, 2004, p. 574). She represents needy as a kind of difference.

She justifies her role choices, her identification with many roles on the busy-ness of the classroom mentor and the unknown needy state of the new teacher. Relational attributional clauses characterize the district and the new teachers as very fortunate: “this district is very fortunate” and “the new teachers are very fortunate.” These are expressed through a cognitive mental projection as Amanda’s opinion: “I just think this district is very fortunate” and “I think the new teachers are very fortunate.” The cognitive mental projection “I think” although not restated extends to the propositions “It helps the campus mentor and it helps that new classroom teacher.” In the content of her thoughts, the propositions, the material process of “help” is lexically repeated to extend to the campus mentor and new teacher. “It helps the campus mentor and it helps that new classroom teacher.” The cause, signaled by the conjunction “because” connects the lack of access to the campus mentor by the new teacher to Amanda’s accessibility as district mentor.

Amanda disagrees with Kerry. Kerry argues above that Amanda as a district mentor is not available to the new teachers when they need her. Amanda counters by summing up her availability. “And I can come in and they [new teachers] have access to me pretty much whenever they want.”

Amanda summarizes the actions she would take for the new teachers by saying “I’m out there trying to find out how to help them in whatever they need.” The process of “trying to find out” is an unrealistic expression of intention. The lexical repetition of “whatever” emphasizes her desire to do for them.

Linda: And again, the biggest shift we’re having is moving that mentor from a mother nurturing role into an instructional support.

The district mentors that we had would kind of just come and stop by and how are you doing. And serving sort of a nurturer, mother type help role.

Not that the nurturing and the mothering is not important. It certainly is. But they need to also be that point person for instructional issues.

The contrast between Linda’s priority of instructional support and Amanda’s performance of mentoring is evident. Linda expects the primary emphasis of mentor work to be on instructional issues with some nurturing. Linda’s desire for changes in the district mentor role was made as a demand. She also prioritized the expectations of mentoring performance. She says, “I explained that I wanted to expand their role. Based on the feedback I’d received I’d really like to expand their role to be more instructional. Not that the nurturing and the mothering is not important. It certainly is. But they need to also be that point person for instructional issues.” Later, she reinforces the point of desire

as expectation by saying, “And again, the biggest shift we’re having is moving that mentor from a mother nurturing role into an instructional support.”

Amanda acts in accordance with Linda’s expectations of instructional support for the new teachers. But, she also meets many other needs of the new teachers. She represents the extended range of her mentor role through describing specific actions designed to meet the needs of the new teachers.

Amanda: Sometimes I find myself in my car driving to go pick them up lunch because they had a bad day. Sometimes I find myself running over to the administration building to find out what do they need to do to get their out of state teaching certificate.

Amanda: I don’t schedule it [new teacher observation] ... I just walk in. I wave at them ... I usually just go sit down in the classroom ... I write down what I see ... I write a little note to them about what I saw.

In the first passage, Amanda extends her description of her work by the use of “driving” and “running” in non-finite dependent clauses. The imperfect “driving” and “running” “means act in progress, actual, present, ongoing, steady state” (Halliday, 2004, p. 426). In the second passage, Amanda uses material process clauses to tell about her work with the new teachers in their classrooms. “I just walk in” (line 39). “I usually just go sit down.” “I write down.” “I write a little note.” “The sequence of her work specifies what she does when she is available for the new teachers. “Driving, to pick up, running over, to find out” are not actions related to instructional issues. They are actions that express care and concern, mothering and nurturing.

Linda’s decision was to add structure to the mentoring program and use the mentoring program as a means to influence classroom management and support the new

instructional initiatives in the district. Linda reported, “So we [including Linda] decided that we needed more structure.” The decision is materialized by the new position of campus new teacher liaison. “And the way to do that was to put a person in a leadership role at the campus as a new teacher liaison.” Linda then goes on to delineate what the role of campus new teacher liaison is. Linda also reconceptualizes the role of the district mentor away from that as a mothering, nurturing figure, to that of an instructional support. “And the mentors are knowledgeable about ... how to align the curriculum and how the assessments, the curriculum, and the instruction should all align. But, I want them [district mentors] to help us [the district] get that off the ground.”

Linda’s actions limit possibilities of actions for both Kerry and Amanda. Kerry as the campus new teacher liaison/mentor responds from her historic experiences as mentor and her commitment to the school. Amanda acts as an instructional support by going into the new teachers’ classrooms and using her training in classroom observation. She also asks the new teachers questions about the use of the curriculum. Kerry goes beyond the limits imposed by the structure of the mentoring program to include actions that answer local new teacher needs. Amanda goes beyond the limits imposed by the structure of the mentoring program to include actions that are nurturing and mothering.

They both go outside the boundaries of their roles to perform mentoring as they see it. Like Linda, they too are engaging in acts of power. Their actions beyond the expectations of the program, their instrumental agency as power is limited by the way they position themselves and each other. Their instrumental agency rests on assumption. The assumption is consent is not needed to mentor from differentiated positionalities.

Operative Agency: Beyond Action, Words, and Perception

Operative agency is not as visible as physical actions. It is not even as apparent as thoughts that are translated into opinions and knowledge. The mode of action for operative agency locates in sensation. Massumi (2002) defines sensation as

... “the perception of perception” or self-referential experience. Sensation pertains to the dimension of passage, or the continuity of immediate experience (and thus to a direct registering of potential). Sensation is unfolding and constitutively vague ... Sensation is endoreferential or self-referential (intensive) (p. 258).

Sensation, the feeling of intensity of unmediated experience includes the presence of unlimited potential actions. Sensation finds its expression in what Kristeva (1986) calls the semiotic. Semiotics is the “heterogeneous disruptive dimension of language, that which can never be caught up in the closure of traditional linguistic theory” (Moi, 1996, p. 13). Another way of describing the semiotic is the imaginary or dream-work. Kristeva (1986) explains that dream-work is the thinking before thought. “The dream work does not think, calculate or judge in any way at all; it restricts itself to giving things a new form” (p. 84).

Through symbolic language – the discourses of experiences, epistemes, and ideologies of educational practice – the mentors shape and form their positionalities in the context of the mentoring program. Their physical activity, cognition, and perception become instrumental agency. The semiotic, on the other hand, manifests not as physical activity, cognition, or perception, but as intuition, wonder and uncertainty. This is the “cry” of the semiotic. To wonder, to be uncertain, to be intuitive is to question from

“‘heterogeneity’... that which is permanently [wanting to escape], [wanting to subvert], but nevertheless [is] in relationship with the standardized” (Star, 1991, p. 39).

Operative agency moves beyond the possibilities of stabilized positionality into the potentialities of re-definition and new meanings (Kristeva, 1986). By wondering and being uncertain, Amanda and Kerry are opening a different mode of action that questions and troubles the changes in the mentoring program.

Uncertainty about mentoring roles

So far, Amanda and Kerry have used physical activity and cognition to design their responses to Linda’s vision of district and campus mentoring. However, in so doing, they have not strayed far from what is expected of them. They have each engaged in acts of power. Each has acted in response from their positionalities as mentors.

The intuition, wonder, and uncertainties of Amanda and Kerry are presented as juxtaposed comments from each. No actual turn taking in conversation ever occurred between Amanda and Kerry.

Amanda: And some of these teachers [new teachers] that you walk in and they know how to use you. [Amanda clarified that use you mean as a resource not as manipulation]. They know to ask you this and ask you for that.

Amanda: I think that they feel like I’m there watching them and so when I ask them questions like are you using the curriculum I sometimes wonder are you just telling me yes because you think I’m going to write you up if you’re not ... So sometimes I feel like they tell me what I want to hear instead of what’s really going on.

Kerry: So I’m trying to give them [new teachers] things that I’ve done or things that I’ve tried in addition to what the district has given me to share with them.

Kerry: I guess using what I got from the district, the power point as a guide. I guess to me my part is putting in things as examples of what I've done with my classrooms.

Kerry: My experience ... I guess I'm helping them knowing what I know from my principal.

The new teachers are the themes in the first passage. Amanda tells about how they relate to her as she does her job. They know she is a resource for them and ask her for different things. Although Amanda does not elaborate on the “this and that” asked for, at other times she talks about getting lunch, certification information, and a computer fixed. Amanda summarizes by saying, “Whatever I can do, whatever.” However, in contrast, in the second passage, Amanda is the theme. Her point is her relationship with the new teachers as she engages in the part of her role that is crucial – instructional issues. In the first sentence Amanda represents her perception cognitively through the mental process “I think.” Her perception is about the new teachers’ perception: “they feel like I’m there watching them.” The next circumstantial theme, “When I ask them questions like are you using the curriculum” puts Amanda into her district designed role of instructional support.

Yet, she wonders about that role. “I sometimes wonder” and “sometimes I feel” both are mental processes originating from her own consciousness. The content of her wonder is a question that she could ask. I ask them, “Are you just telling me yes because you think I’m going to write you up if you’re not?” The effect of using an exemplar of her own direct language is immediacy and genuineness. The wonder is more real than if she represented the content of her wonder as more generic as in, “I wonder about what

they're telling me." "Sometimes I feel" is intuition. What Amanda is sensing is uncertainty about the new teachers' responses to her presence in their classrooms for the surveillance of instruction.

In three places, Kerry says "I guess" as a mental projection. "I guess using what I got from the district, the power point as a guide" and "I guess to me my part is putting in things as examples of what I've done with my classrooms" are the first two instances. In these two Kerry expresses uncertainty about the way she is using the power points as a guide for further examples. Kerry is critical of her own positionality. Sharing the power points is part of her structural role, but she is not sure if the way she should be presenting the power points to the new teachers is through the discourse of her experiences. "I guess I'm helping them knowing what I know from my principal" is the third instance of uncertainty. Kerry puts into question the matter of efficacy. Is her experiential knowledge about the campus helpful to the new teachers?

Ambiguity about difference

Kerry: But it's going to take more than one observation and that's why I think you need someone on the campus. If there's a problem you can go right to them and they are there ... But I don't know if they have built a relationship with the district mentor either. They know me. They see me. They see me every day and they know to ask for help. Where I don't know if they even know what schedule [the district mentor has] so how do they know when to have questions or not.

Amanda: I think and I'm making an assumption here because I haven't asked them but I think that it's a trust issue. I think that they're [new teachers] looking at me as a district person who's coming in and watching them instead of a mentor who is there to help them and assist them ... I do think it's a trust issue.

Kerry's first passage is an argument for the importance of the campus mentor.

Twice she uses the adversative conjunction "but:" "but it's going to take more than one

observation” and “but I don’t know.” The first sets up a relationship between one observation of a new teacher she has made and the idea that one is not going to be enough. This specific example is used to justify her claim that a mentor is needed on the campus all the time. The claim is stated as a cognitive mental process projection. “I think you need someone on the campus.” In this case, “I think” is an expression of her opinion. What follows is a conditional “if.” “If there’s a problem, you can go right to them and they are there.”

The second use of “but” combines with another cognitive mental process projection “I don’t know” followed by the conditional preposition “if.” The conditional “if” is used “to specify an element on which the actualization of the process depends” (Halliday, 2004, p. 271). Kerry says, “If there’s a problem you can go right to them and they are there.” The pattern of cognitive mental projections, the adversative, “but,” and the conditional “if” represents doubts that Kerry has about the relationship between the new teachers and the district mentor.

Kerry adds contrast to make her point by switching themes to “they” meaning the new teachers. “They know me. They see me.” Kerry, by focusing on them emphasizes their relationship with her as assured because of shared availability. She ends by again expressing her doubt through another cognitive mental projection and conditional situation.

Kerry knows that she is available and it is her opinion that being on campus establishes a relationship with the new teachers. She is uncertain about the relationship between the district mentor and the new teachers. The congruent expression for “I don’t

know if they have built a relationship with that district mentor” would be “I know that they may or may not have built a relationship.” Congruently, “I don’t know if they even know what schedule” would be “I know that they may or may not know what schedule.”

Amanda repeats the cognitive mental process “I think” as a projection through the idea “that it’s a trust issue.” She elaborates on the idea by giving her opinion about how the new teachers perceive her: “they’re looking at me as a district person who’s coming in and watching them instead of a mentor who is there to help them and assist them.” “Instead” is an additive conjunction of extension as variation by replacement (Halliday, 2004). According to Amanda, the new teachers want support but see her role as surveillance. She represents the new teachers’ perception of the reality of her job as not matching her own perspective.

Reading from Amanda’s perspective, it’s not her experience and district position that disrupts the relationship, it is the new teachers not “getting it.” “Which is not my role but I just don’t know if they [new teachers] get that yet.” Amanda does not question her positionality. She puts the onus of not being able to establish a mentoring relationship on the new teachers. Her uncertainties are about how the new teachers relate to her role. The projection “I think” is about Amanda’s opinion. While opinions are taken as certainty, they are open to the possibility of change.

Question: Do you think there would be a problem with the campus-based mentors seeing their role differently?

Amanda: I don’t know because I don’t know what they see their role as now. I don’t know what is required of a campus-based mentor in this district ... I’m not sure that they do know and so maybe it would be a positive thing for someone to have a training and define it for them. This is what you are expected to do.

Kerry: I'm not real sure what their function [the district mentors] is. But, I know what my responsibility is. I'm supposed to do the power points and guess be here ... But I really don't know what the district level mentor's purpose is.

Amanda talks about her lack of knowledge about the work of the campus based mentors. She is certain of her lack of knowledge about the role of the campus based mentor and she expresses this certainty twice. First she expresses her reason for not knowing as not knowing what the campus based mentors' perception of their role is. "I don't know because I don't know what they see their role as now." Then she follows with a cognitive mental projection of not knowing what their structural role is. "I don't know what is required of a campus based mentor in this district."

Amanda then switches to uncertainty. "I'm not real sure" is an attributional relational process with a negative polarity. She characterizes herself as unsure about whether or not the campus-based mentors know their roles. Her conclusion begins with the causal conditional conjunction "so" (Halliday, 2004). The use of "maybe" as a mood adjunct of likelihood is thematic. "A modal adjunct ... is quite likely to be thematic: these items are characteristic of dialogue, in which the speaker may be ... expressing his or her own angle on the matter in hand, whether probable" (Halliday, 2004, p. 84). Amanda is stating her possible solution to the problematic of campus based mentors not knowing their roles. "Maybe" is a modal adjunct of low likelihood or possibility and her commitment to this suggestion is tenuous. What "someone" should do is expressed as the perfective or infinitive form "to have" and "to define." Both express the potential or the future action of training and defining.

The conclusion introduces “someone” as others to act as agents in changing the situation. Agency is put on “someone.” Represented as the nominal element in the prepositional phrase, “for someone,” “someone” is a participant in the process of having a training and defining campus mentor roles (Halliday, 2004). These undesignated agents add to the sense of unrealis of Amanda’s proposed solution. Changing the role of the campus based mentors is not an action that the campus based mentors can achieve. It needs to fall to those outside of their ranks. It needs to be done by someone other than the campus mentors themselves.

Kerry’s response in this imagined conversation is also represented by uncertainty as to the function and purpose of the district mentors. She contrasts this with a certainty of knowledge about her own positionality. “I know what my responsibility is.” She represents no possibilities for learning about the district mentor’s role.

Uncertainty about legitimacy

Kerry: I don’t know why they started the district level mentor with only three. I don’t know when, why they shifted from having teachers as mentors. I mean I guess I can understand because I think some teachers felt that when they were asked were obligated to do it ... I don’t know if they were trying to eliminate that for teachers ... but I felt like after I had been involved in it, I felt like I was doing the work and someone else was coming in and getting the recognition ... I don’t know why they changed it.

Amanda: because they [the district]do want to retain those teachers [new teachers]. So I think their goal was and still is, if we put an extra level of support in there; if we put in someone who’s objective, who’s not on the campus, who can come in and work with these teachers that doesn’t report to their principal ... So I think their whole thing is to provide an extra level or just another person in there that is not tied to evaluations, not tied to anything negative ... I think their whole goal was to try to give that extra level. Someone else for that teacher. Someone to turn to make their first year that much easier. To hopefully maintain them [new teachers] so they will stay with us and stay in the district.

Amanda and Kerry are uncertain about the mentoring program. Throughout Kerry's passage, she represents her uncertainty and her feelings. She begins by saying, "I don't know why" in the first two sentences. "Consequently, mental clauses representing an undecided state of mind are used to project indirect questions. These include clauses of wondering and doubting, finding out and checking, and tend to be characterized by special lexical verbs such as *wonder*, *ascertain* [italics original]" (Halliday, 2004, pp. 450-451). Even though Kerry did not specifically use "I wonder," she is wondering why. She wants to know the reasons the mentoring program is now structured as it is. Kerry's questions are directly related to her consistently expressed concern about the district mentor position. "They started with only three" and "they shifted from having teachers as mentors" refer back to descriptive comments made earlier in her text. "But the district has revamped what they're doing so we don't have teachers mentoring new teachers. What they have is a district level mentor. There are three retired teachers that are to come in and check on all the new teachers. But they are responsible for a third of the district."

Kerry suggests one possibility to explain why the program was changed. She expresses that possibility with "I think," a mental cognitive projection of uncertainty about the reaction of teachers to being a mentor. She also uses another mental cognitive projection of "I guess" suggesting low commitment to her understanding of the program changes because of lack of teacher interest. Again, uncertainty is represented by "I don't know" followed by the conditional "if" in "if they were trying to eliminate that for teachers."

Kerry goes back to her experience as a campus mentor before the program changes as the context for her feelings. “But I felt like after I had been involved in it, I felt like I was doing the work and someone else was coming in and getting the recognition.” A mental process “I felt like” frames her idea of “I was doing the work and someone else was coming in and getting the recognition.” It is Kerry’s feelings question her usefulness and importance to the mentoring program. Kerry ends the passage with a repetition. “I don’t know why they changed it.” Kerry consistently wonders and questions the mentoring program changes.

In the first line of her passage, Amanda is uncertain about the goal of the mentoring program. Amanda through a cognitive mental projection states her uncertainty about the goal. “I think their goal was and still is.” She then elaborates on the tactics for reaching that goal as conditional circumstances. She reports as if she were the district thinking through a choice of tactics for achieving the goal of retaining new teachers. “We” is the district in “if we put in an extra level of support” and “if we put in someone who’s objective.” She then elaborates on the characteristics of the “someone” through a series of elaborating relative clauses. “[Someone] who’s not on the campus who can come in and work with the teachers that doesn’t report to their principal.”

She repeats her uncertainty by again saying “I think” in reference to the district goal. She places the goal into an unrealistic statement of future intent “to try to give.” What the district intends to give, “an extra level” is cohesive with “if we put an extra level of support.” It is also textually cohesive with Amanda’s earlier description of her structural positionality: “I’m an additional step.”

The cohesiveness is strengthened by Amanda's elaboration of the relationship between the "someone" and the new teacher: "someone else for that teacher." She also elaborates on the outcome of the relationship: "someone to turn to to make their first year that much easier." Her conclusion is the new teachers mentored by the insertion of this "someone" i.e. district mentor – herself – the chances of retention go up. Even though Amanda sees the district mentor as the "someone" who will help retain the new teacher, she is not sure if this is the goal of the district.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, STUDY LIMITATIONS, QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY, AND IMPLICATIONS OF THIS STUDY ON FUTURE RESEARCH

This study is focused on the district mentor for Rio School District and the campus liaison/mentor for Lundgren Elementary School and the way power operates within the space of institutionalization as Rio ISD makes changes in the new teacher mentoring program. In particular, it is about what happens when the agency of the district director, the district mentor, and campus based mentor come together in the space of this institutionalization. Specifically authoritative power, instrumental agency as power, and operative agency as power were located and described in the space of institutionalization.

In establishing the mentoring program, power is evident through the agency of the district director, Linda, the district mentor, Amanda, and the campus liaison/mentor, Kerry. Their instrumental agency, their action choices in response to needs was the primary form of expressing power. Their subject positionality as their discourse of interpreted educational experience combined with their structural positionality as the discourses of the district gauged the possibilities and guided their decisions as to actions. Through their physical actions, speech, and thoughts of certainty, their instrumental agency was manifested.

Instrumental Agency

Non-consciousness

The instrumental agency of Linda, her actions, changed the district mentoring program. Linda has the legitimate authority to direct the mentoring program. She evaluated the functioning mentor program to determine the need for changes. She conceptually re-aligned the work of the district mentor to function as support for the new district curricular, instructional, and testing initiatives. She established a new position, campus new teacher liaison and regulated the content of the information they were to share with new teachers on the campus. She initiated a regular district mentor meeting schedule and added on-going training as part of the meeting purpose. She added Amanda as a district mentor. All of these actions are within the authority of Linda as she works to establish the changes in the mentoring program as legitimate.

Amanda and Kerry choose to perform mentoring as a response to the mentoring program changes. That is, their practice of mentoring goes beyond the expected norms of the district. Amanda extends her role of district mentor beyond that of instructional support for the new teachers by running errands, tending to their administrative business, listening to problems, and counseling even late into the evening. Kerry expands her role by localizing district information to the particulars of Lundgren Elementary. She gives advice about procedures and exemplifies the way to be a teacher at Lundgren Elementary. Amanda sees the needs of the new teacher as beyond just instructional support. Kerry translates needs into practicality.

Instrumental agency is about reading needs. Reading is about interpretation as working toward a personal understanding of a situation or thing or person. Interpretation and working toward understanding is reading others' positionality from the context of one's own. Linda reads the needs of the mentoring program from her experience as a principal working with the mentoring program and as the district director struggling with district priorities, too little time, and money. Amanda reads the needs of the new teachers as more than instructional support. This reading is prompted by the combination of her training as an assistant principal and her day-to-day interactions with the new teachers. Kerry reads the needs of the new teachers from her long association with her principal and her training to be an administrator.

The reading and interpretation of the needs of the new teachers backgrounds their instrumental agency. It acts as a non-consciousness that colors their actions. This is not unconsciousness or unawareness. It is not about not thinking about what is in the conscious mind or refusing to acknowledge what is in the conscious mind. It is not false-consciousness in that it does not arise from the consciousness of their mentoring status as a classification or group. Traces of the structural discourses surrounding their roles as district mentor or campus mentor are part of their non-consciousness. However, non-consciousness is more idiosyncratic by being bound to a combination of structural and subject positionalities. Individuation disturbs the concomitance of class and working conditions and the platform needed for the realization of a false consciousness.

Non-consciousness as it relates to instrumental agency is explained by an example from Massumi (2002). People with blind-sight as a result of brain injury consider

themselves blind. But if presented with an object and asked to grasp it, they can. In an experiment conducted with people with partial blind-sight, a word was presented in their field of vision. Two different words both of which could be associated with the original word were presented in their field of non-vision. When the people were asked the meaning of the original word, they gave the meaning associated with the meaning of one of the words presented to their “blindness.”

Non-consciousness is about a practiced or habitual meaning that permeates through to consciously derive more meaning (Massumi, 2002). It is the interpreted meaning of the discourses of subject and structure that are not reflexively challenged. They are not challenged because they are so much a part of their way of thinking that they seep into the actions, words and thoughts, to influence the reading of need and therefore the instrumental actions. Linda, Amanda, and Kerry all read mentoring needs from the non-consciousness of their positionalities and translate those needs into instrumental actions. The consequences of non-consciousness are differentiation and normalization.

Differentiation in the space of institutionalization: Pluralism

When Amanda positioned Kerry in the mentoring program, she was reading what Kerry does as a campus liaison/mentor. From non-consciousness, Amanda’s own interpretation toward understanding, she cannot reconcile the way Kerry reads the needs of new teachers and chooses actions to the way she reads new teacher needs and makes action choices. Kerry does the same thing. What they both do is classify or differentiate the other. To Kerry, Amanda’s instrumental agency, her way of being in action cannot

possibly be what it means to be a mentor. To Amanda, Kerry's instrumental agency, her way of being in action cannot possibly be what it means to be a mentor.

Both Amanda and Kerry are locked by their structural and subject discourses into static positionalities that limit possibilities of choice of actions. Limiting actions in response to needs is necessary otherwise a state of voluntarism exists. But, the problem is that discursal positional stability cannot get outside of itself to recognize that others are also acting from their own positionality. It is not the difference of their actions, but the non-recognition of the source of the difference of their actions that leads to differentiation. Non-recognition of difference makes each other "an other." As "an other" they only consider the totality of each other's positionality. The other is objectified in this case as being either district mentor or campus liaison/mentor. When considered as "an other," when differentiated, boundaries are more tightly drawn around positionality. How they perform mentoring is about protecting their positionality.

Protected positionality, non-recognition of each other's differences makes each individually "other" to the mentoring program. How each performs mentoring is an individual reaction to the changes in the mentoring program. What Amanda does as she performs mentoring has nothing to do with the way that Kerry performs mentoring. It does not matter that each performs mentoring outside the expectations of the district. Performing outside expectations may be considered a foible, a quirk that can easily be erased through surveillance or performing outside expectations may be accepted as a part of the mentoring role.

What is happening is that a tendency toward pluralism is being brought into the mentoring program. Pluralism is about differentiation. Differentiation forecloses around and disguises difference. Differentiation is assumed to be difference and is accepted as necessary for the achievement of the mentoring program goals i.e. the successful performance of the new teachers and their retention in the district. Pluralism is based on an agreement of difference, on a commonality of understanding that positionalities are “reality as it “really” is” (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 2004, p. 463). Pluralism is about consensus, agreeing to accept differentiation as a legitimate part of what happens in the space of institutionalization (Fairclough, 2003).

A consistent theme of the study is the apparent lack of communication among the actors. Emanating from Linda, Amanda, and Kerry is a consistent recalcitrance to talk to each other. This lack of communication manifests in Linda’s comment about no more planned trainings for the campus liaison/mentors; the insistence on privileged knowledge about the new teachers by Amanda; and, the reluctance to state opinions about mentoring program changes by Kerry and the principal, Ilsa.

A cursory read would interpret this as a lack of communication easily remedied by calling a meeting and talking. But, this perfunctory read would misname differentiation as lack of communication and not recognize the inherent presence of differentiation in the space of institutionalization of the mentoring program.

At the same time that they all refuse to engage in communication, Amanda, Kerry, and Ilsa all desire it. Amanda and Kerry’s desire to talk is about establishing a commonality of purpose in regard to mentoring performance. Ilsa wants to be involved

with the district mentor in the formative development of the new teachers. The desire should be applauded because it signals recognition of an absence of dialogue and conversation in the processes of establishing the mentoring program. However, a conversation in the presence of differentiation as mediator would only reinforce stasis of positionality and pluralism. Ellsworth (1997) speaks to this when she says “Educators constantly associate dialogue with democracy ... as when dialogue is seen as a neutral means for fulfilling a shared desire for understanding even if differences of opinion and power remain” (p. 82).

Normalization in the space of institutionalization: Objectification

Normality allows the mentors to choose possible actions from the discourse of their own experiences and/or from the discourse of the district to meet the needs of the new teachers. Normality of actions involves disciplining. Disciplining is in both senses of the word. Disciplining, as an act of correction is necessary to keep the mentors inside the district constructed and accepted knowledge as “a discipline of mentoring.” This is what Foucault (1994) refers to as knowledge/power. The act of disciplining the mentors grounds in the concept of governmental care. As people come to be more under the care of government, they could be lost. However, government has the duty to care for, not lose its population. Therefore, to make care possible individuals must give over some individuality to more generic patterns of action. Of course, disciplining in this sense also is about surveillance or a watchfulness of performance. In the case of the mentors, disciplining for normality would involve consensual agreement about both the possible and potential range of mentoring performance and about surveillance. Normality for the

mentors would be consent between Linda as legitimate authority (government) and the mentors to perform mentoring as agreed upon under a consensual surveillance.

Normalization is the failure to establish a consensual agreement about choice of possible actions and consensual surveillance of choice. Normalization limits the power of instrumental agency. Too much emphasis on the discourses of structural positionality is objectification. Objectification is the intense bonding of need with use so that the subject positionality of the mentors is subsumed into the structural positionality of the mentors. Who the mentors are, the discourses of their educational experiences that guide their actions in response to new teacher needs is not deemed as important as the discourses surrounding their structural positionality. The personhood of the mentor is overshadowed by the discourses of their job. The mentors become invisible, almost able to be replicated as they perform mentoring in expected and set ways.

Objectification institutionalizes mentoring as a technology, a useful intermediary between the inexperienced new teacher and the needs of the district for the new teacher to conform to curricular, instructional, and testing initiatives and classroom management procedures. Mentoring programs in which mentors act as “local guides” emphasize “explaining school policies and practices, sharing methods and materials, [and] solving immediate problems” (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1992, p. 14). The Texas Beginning Educator System (TxBESS) (Texas State Board of Educator Certification, January 2005) exemplifies a local guide program. TxBESS normalizes the work of the mentor as revolving around a set of new teacher performance standards translated into a developmental continuum. The new teacher who is mentored with the TxBESS standards

is expected to be increasingly proficient on the twenty-two performance standards and to feel ready for evaluation by administrators on the state teacher appraisal system. The role of the mentor is focused on the development of the new teacher in relationship with the standards of the continuum. The role of the mentor is a technology, a specific technique for bringing a new teacher into a relationship with a set of standards. The mentor as a technologist becomes a socializer to teacher culture, a provider of common teaching vocabulary, and a refiner of teaching practice. As nominalizations, “socializer,” “provider,” and “refiner” disguise the complexity of the relationships, the processes, and the learnings necessary to becoming a teacher. The mentor as a technology is a conduit for perpetuating the relationship of the new teacher and the standards.

The district can legitimately set certain standards or expectations for instruction and classroom management. Having mentors socialize new teachers into the ways of the district is legitimate. However, if structural positionality speaks as subject positionality, there is no consensual agreement about the choice of actions to meet new teacher needs.

Linda’s management tactics (regulatory meetings and staffing decisions) to establish the changes in the mentoring program are surveillance. Through this surveillance, it is possible to examine or judge Amanda and Kerry’s mentoring performances as to “fit.” Amanda as a district mentor is more likely to come under surveillance than Kerry. This is because her performance of mentoring is more likely to be objectified for the use of the district mentoring program than Kerry’s. Amanda positions herself closely with the district mentoring program and is also positioned so by Linda. She is expected to be primarily a mentor that is focused on new teacher

instructional support. Her performance of mentoring, the changes she made through reading new teacher needs to what she does is more likely to be surveyed and judged.

One of the limitations of this study is duration. It does not cover a time period long enough to see if Amanda and Kerry's mentoring performances are judged or examined. However, the possibility is suggested. Linda repeatedly emphasizes that she expects the district mentors to act primarily as instructional support to the new teachers. When judged or measured against that norm of expectation, Amanda's performance of mentoring will either be rejected or accepted and made part of the norm. Eventually Kerry's will be judged, also. Kerry hints at this when she says she had to finish the power points by January. Their performance of mentoring may ultimately be disciplined. Their performance of mentoring may ultimately be included as a norm. In either way, their instrumental agency is always subject to discipline and surveillance.

Authoritative Power

Surveillance and discipline are legitimate responsibilities of the district. However, if the act of surveillance is for the service of discipline in both meanings and, if the act of surveillance is colored by the non-consciousness of Linda or the mentors or others involved, then the mentoring program itself is in danger of stasis. Surveillance that can't help move the mentors out of their own differences as normalized positionalities limits the instrumental agency of the mentors even more. They would be reckoning with not only their own self imposed limitations from their own non-consciousness, but with the imposed limitations from Linda's non-consciousness as it works as surveillance.

This is not an argument for objective surveillance or examination – evaluation techniques based on a standard of performance. This is about the recognition of the need for criticality. In the process of surveillance, Linda first made changes in the mentoring program based on her experiences and her read of the district needs. At least, in part she made the changes from non-consciousness (her own and perhaps others). If she surveys or examines the mentors' performances without criticality, she can only examine and discipline mentoring from her non-consciousness. Even if she uses an “objective measure, a set of standards of mentoring performance, if there is no criticality, her read will still be through the lens of her non-consciousness.

Surveillance is then caught in a self-perpetuating loop. Looping feedback surveillance strengthens the differentiation and normalization of the mentoring program. In a tautological-like instance, the mentors' performances are judged and sorted. Those performances meeting or approximating the expectations of the district mentor and campus liaison/mentor will be deemed acceptable. In totality, those performances continue to feed the meaning of the mentoring program until those performances become the mentoring program.

Through looping feedback surveillance on the part of Amanda, Kerry, and Linda, and others, what is realized in the space of institutionalization is a mentoring program that is rationalized. Its reason for being is supported “by reference to the utility of institutionalized action” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 98). It relies on conceptualizing difference as “consensus, a normalization and acceptance of differences of power” (p. 98). That is, differences of instrumental agency determined by static positionalities. The ecology of

the space of institutionalization is threatened. Specifically, the mentoring program changes will be institutionalized but the program will increasingly tend toward a design for the mentor role to be that of “local guides” (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1992, p. 14).

Criticality, the public questioning, challenging, and interrogating of acts of differentiation and normalization, as surveillance re-orientes actions and words toward acceptance of differences as a way of normality. Critical surveillance would unmask non-consciousness and open up the awareness of the relationship of the structural and subject positionalities as determiners of instrumental agency. Surveillance would call attention to itself and insist on an interrogation of its source. Instead of being locked into increasingly deterministic and static ways of performing mentoring, the mentors could work their differences for understanding their relationship to the technology of mentoring and the broader implications of mentoring. They would also be brought into an awareness of the way Linda’s, their own, and others’ non-consciousness work in the process of surveillance and examination.

Through critical surveillance, the performance of their mentoring can no longer be considered resistance. The performances of mentoring, what Amanda and Kerry did that was considered to be outside of the expectations and definitions of their roles through critical surveillance is brought inside. Their performance of mentoring is surveyed and judged not against a standard of expectation but qualitatively. Does the particular mentoring performance add depth of understanding of the needs of the new teachers from the differences of positionalities of Linda, Amanda, and Kerry?

Their instrumental agency as power is still analyzed actions that are possibilities. But the discourses surrounding their structural and subject positions seen as differences open up other ways of analysis that lead to actions that are relationships of power. Their instrumental agency encompasses the consent of each other for action and allows for freedom of action for both. They are able to examine issues such as instructional support and classroom management from their different positionalities and work the differences for understanding. The actions of instrumental agency, what they do and say as mentors are still analyzed, but analyzed through “partial, interested, and potentially oppressive” (Ellsworth, 1994, p. 322) knowledge of each other. Resistance is refocused. Resistance can no longer be interpellated as antagonistic. Instead, if resistance is called, it will answer to agonism. “Rather than speaking of an essential antagonism, it would be better to speak of an “agonism” – of a relationship that is at the same time mutual incitement and struggle; less of a face-to-face confrontation that paralyzes both sides than a permanent provocation” (Foucault, 1994, p. 342).

Summary

Instrumental agency as a mode of power is prevalent in the space of institutionalization of the mentoring program. It is easily recognized since it is the actions the mentors take and the words they speak. The instrumental agency of the mentors can be a source of the development of relationships of power. However, when one’s instrumental agency does not acknowledge the instrumental agency of another, static positionalities result. Differentiation as an act of power determines a mentoring program that is prone to pluralism and is incapable of overcoming pluralism by establishing

connectivity through communication. Normalization as an act of power determines a mentoring program centered on mentors as objects for use as a technology and rationalizes its existence under a guise of legitimate propagation of selected ways to do mentoring.

Differentiation and normalization as acts of power and looping feedback surveillance centered in non-consciousness ignore criticality. Critical surveillance of the work of non-consciousness in program choice and examination allows for a qualitative surveillance and examination of new teacher needs. Instrumental agency as power still is actions from possibilities, but there is freedom of consensual actions. Resistance is refocused as a struggle or agonism about differences.

A question generates from the conceptualizations of the workings of authoritative power and instrumental agency in the space of institutionalization. How is criticality brought into the space of institutionalization?

Operative Agency

Operative agency originates in sensing and feeling. It is important that questions and uncertainty are articulated out loud, verbally. At the point temporally and spatially that Amanda and Kerry's wonder or uncertainty becomes an expression, words carried on breath, the world of probabilities and potentialities is glimpsed. At that moment what is, the habitually known, the reading and interpretation of needs from the non-consciousness of positionality is detached. The regulatory of discourses as set meanings is put aside by individualized language reaching into the self as imagination.

The expression of language by Amanda and Kerry changes from propositions of certainty to projections of thought itself as separate from content. The projection of thought belongs to the individual. It resides with Amanda and Kerry. The idea, the content of the thought is put out there for others to read or hear it (Halliday, 2004). It can be discursively made by readers or listeners.

The having of the thought expressed in verbiage of wonder and uncertainty escapes as potentiality and probability from the totality of Amanda and Kerry's discourses that are determined by social and historical contexts. Potentiality and probability are not about voluntarism. Potentiality is the ability to think and conceive of what might be. Probability is the likelihood or reasonable hope of becoming. Potentiality and probability allow for the imagining of other actions without the filters of analysis and evaluation.

Language is employed differently through operative agency. Because the imagination, the dream world, the semiotic is always already a part of the self, it may break through to produce new meanings or borrow sign systems from other fields and reinterpret their meanings. The way Amanda and Kerry mentor, their relationship to each other, and their relationship to the program may be expressed through different words or through giving new meanings to the familiar. Kristeva (1986) says,

The new object may well still retain some link with the old ideological object, *elements* [italics original] may be found in it which belong to the old object, too: but the meaning of these elements changes with the new *structure* [italics original], which precisely confers to them their meaning... We know that any renewal of scientific thought is carried out by and through a renewal of terminology: there is only invention as such when a new term appears (pp. 79-80).

Kristeva is talking about change and the way change redefines meaning. In the case of Amanda and Kerry, they undergo significant changes to the structure and conception of the mentoring program. They respond through instrumental agency as power. They also respond through the language of wonder and uncertainty. The language of wonder and uncertainty is the language that is always already breaking free from the language of logical explanation, the language of objectivity, the language that Haraway's (1997) modest witness would have used to describe his viewing of Boyle's vacuum. The language of wonder and uncertainty is disruptive to the analyzed filter of the language of instrumental agency. That language is subjugated by analysis and reason as the language of Foucault's power/knowledge. The language of wonder and uncertainty carries traces of analyzed language, but breaks through to question and trouble. It is authentic language since it is always already there, in waiting to be called forth. When called forth, the language of wonder and uncertainty is criticality and is a tool that can "dismantle the master's house (Lorde, 1984, p. 112 as cited in Ellsworth, 1994, p. 306).

Kerry is uncertain about the effectiveness of her experiential knowledge as a discourse of subject positionality. When Kerry guesses about the effectiveness of her experiential knowledge with the new teachers, she is feeling the mismatch between her subject positionality and her structural positionality. She is asking about efficacy of the totality of subject and structural positionality as interpreters of new teacher's needs.

Amanda is uncertain about the new teachers' responses to her role. When Amanda wonders about the way the new teachers see her, she is feeling the weight of the

emphasis of structural positionality over the way she performs mentoring i.e. mothering, counseling, befriending, and administrating.

They are wondering about their roles as mentors from their positional place in the grid of the space of institutionalization. Their expressions of wonder and uncertainty call out from that space. Both Amanda and Kerry are engaging the potentiality that their subject and structural roles could be other than they are and the probability that there is hope to becoming different. They are wondering about new meanings perhaps that carry the trace of the old in light of the changes in the mentoring program.

De-objectifying normalization

This wonder and this uncertainty challenge normalization of roles. The performance of defined district mentoring actions does not determine being a district mentor. The performance of defined campus liaison/mentor does not determine being a campus liaison/mentor. They are sensing and feeling that there is more complexity to their subject positionality as built around their discourses of educational experience than is recognized through the normalization of their positionalities.

There is movement of potentiality in the grid space of their positionalities. Operative agency as a mode of power challenges normalization by questioning the correspondence of their subject and structural positions. The uncertainties that Amanda and Kerry express are only stirrings within their grid space of positionalities. What is only hinted at and not fully recognized in the study by Linda or by Amanda or Kerry is the power of operative agency in the space of institutionalization of the mentoring program. In particular, what is not recognized is the power of operative agency to express

uncertainty and then go on to give new meanings to mentoring performance. New meanings de-objectify mentors by inserting potential and probability as techniques of criticality. Criticality becomes more than a struggle over differing ideologies or position in hegemonic domination. Criticality as potential and probability of new meanings allows uncertainties and re-definitions to act as multi-participant evaluations of the mentoring program “oriented to equality and heterogeneous well-being” (Haraway, 1997, p. 95). Mentors are no longer objects within the mentoring program. Instead, they critically work to answer the question of whose needs do the mentors serve (Ellsworth, 1997).

Deconstructing plurality

As much time as Amanda and Kerry spend in differentiating each other and acting instrumentally out of their own positionality, through operative agency as wonder and uncertainty they do begin to recognize the possibility of differences. Kerry expresses uncertainty as to the function of the district mentors. Amanda expresses uncertainty through a twist in the language. She is certain that she is uncertain about the role of the campus liaison/mentor. She is also uncertain about whether or not the campus liaison/mentors know what their role is. Not knowing and being uncertain about the function and roles of each other implies a stirring of curiosity about each other. What is now thinkable and conceivable is that Amanda and Kerry don't have knowledge about each other's subject or structural positionality.

Operative agency is not recognized in the space of institutionalization of the mentoring program as a deconstructor of pluralism. When differentiation is challenged from the realization of authentic differences not only between structural positions but also

between interpretations of need and answers of action, Amanda and Kerry can reconceptualize their relationship to each other and to the mentoring program. In the ecology of the space of institutionalization, there is “an openness to, acceptance of, recognition of difference; an exploration of difference, as in ‘dialogue’ in the richest sense of the term” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 192).

Questioning legitimization

Amanda and Kerry both have uncertainties about the design of the mentoring program. Kerry is unsure about why mentoring program changes were made. She is unsure about why the district started with three mentors and how the three are going to service the whole district. She thinks the reason was that classroom teachers abdicated their work with new teachers because of lack of time. Through her operative agency she questions why time for mentoring is given a low priority. Amanda is uncertain about the way a district mentor is to be a part the goal of the mentoring program to retain new teachers. She thinks she understands that she is to act as confidant for the new teachers. She is to keep the new teachers’ problems to herself as she helps solve them.

Operative agency is not recognized in the space of institutionalization of the mentoring program as a source of moral evaluation. When operative agency is recognized as moral evaluation, legitimacy is “by reference to the value system” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 98) of not only the program, but also the district. A mentoring program that requests the question of whose interests are being served by what we as the participants are doing (Ellsworth, 1997) is creating a healthy ecology. The space of institutionalization becomes less amenable to vagaries of political expediency caused by changes in district leadership,

changes in curricular and instructional epistemes, and changes in the availability of resources. The space of institutionalization is amenable to criticality as “evaluative, public, multiactor, multiagenda, oriented to equality and heterogeneous well-being (Haraway, 1997, p. 95).

Study Limitations and Questions for Further Study

The limitations of the study drive the questions of further study. The biggest limitation is duration of the study. The study did not last long enough to see how surveillance and discipline as authoritative power, the actions associated with the instrumental agency of Amanda and Kerry, and the wonderings of operative agency continued to interact and shape the mentoring program and the space of institutionalization. Therefore, other studies of a longer duration or studies that engage with institutionalization at a different point in time might continue to explore how power works.

The other limitation is the descriptive nature of the study. It is said that description “requires a clear and distinct knowledge of both the object and the writer’s intention” (Glorfeld, Kakonis, & Wilcox, 1967, p. 237). The object of this study is power in the space of institutionalization of a new teacher mentoring program. The intention is to show through the particular actions of Amanda and Kerry the way power works in establishing a mentoring program in Rio School District and Lundgren Elementary School. It is also said that description is “to persuade his [sic] reader to visualize that object as [the writer] does” (p. 237). Inherent in the intention of telling about Amanda and Kerry is persuading readers to a point of view about power in the particular case of

Rio School District and Lundgren Elementary. Persuasion through description is an invitation for other points of view about the way power works in other instances of institutionalization. Further studies either from education or from other fields of study that either corroborate or challenge the point of view of this study would add to the knowledge bases of power and institutionalization of programs.

Specifically, in response to the study's limited duration and descriptive nature, there are four major questions of interest.

- How do school district leaders and others in institutionalization projects recognize objectification and pluralism as differentiation and normalization?
- What happens to the processes of change as power enters the space of institutionalization?
- How do school district leaders recognize and respond to the uncertainties of participants as operative agency?
- What happens to mentoring programs in a space of institutionalization that encompasses descriptions of institutionalization phases, procedures, and the workings of power?

Implications of This Study on Future Research

How do school district leaders and others in institutionalization projects recognize normalization as objectification and differentiation as pluralism?

This is a question about the formations of power that appear as institutionalization is taking place. The implication is that it is a political necessity to find these formations of power, the relations of power as the presences of acts of power or relationships of

power (Foucault, 1994). Understanding formations of power is about understanding politics, the “realistic process of making decisions and allocating resources in a context of scarcity and divergent interests” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 181). Understanding formations of power is about how the complexity of power operates to close down or open up ways of using resources and representing multiple interests. It is on the point of multiple interests that the analysis of power enters the space of institutionalization. For example, the recognition of the multiple interests of mentors, district leadership, mentoring programs, contextual traditions, and limited resources makes decision making more complex but does not remove it from the political. Instead, it makes decisions more politically resistant to charges of self-interest and political persuasion.

Foucault (1994) suggests five ways to analyze power.

1. Analysis of the “system of differentiations.” Differentiation makes possible acts of power. In particular, analysis of differences in positionality; differences in the nature of the work; differences in status; differences in competency; and, differences of allocation and appropriation of resources among others would locate formations of power.
2. Analysis of “the types of objectives.” The perusal of objectives in establishing a program is about power. Questioning the purpose of program objectives as to maintenance of status, compliance with policies, insertion of ideology or epistemological bias, and others would locate formations of power.
3. The analysis of “instrumental modes.” This is the analysis of how power is manifested. Is power manifested through force, persuasion, surveillance, rules, traditions, or allocation of resources? Searching for the answers to these questions would locate formations of power.
4. Analysis of “forms of institutionalization.” This is historical analysis of the way power has come to be. The origins of power as tradition, habit, regulatory, or otherwise explicates the cultural context of power that would locate formations of power.
5. Analysis of “the degrees of rationalization.” This is analysis of expediency and efficacy. The question is how does power both

constitute and react to the feasibility of the program in relation to the value and effectiveness of a program. Through analysis of the rationale of the program, formations of power can be located (pp. 344-345).

More research needs to be done on the development of viable quantitative and qualitative tools of analysis of power for leaders in the institutionalization of programs such as mentoring programs. However, the development of quantitative and qualitative tools of analysis must be embedded in the purpose of criticality. Without criticality that is public from the viewpoint of multiply-identified participants with multiple agendas for the purpose of the good of all, the space of institutionalization does not change. It remains a space for description of phases and prescription of procedural steps (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Hall & Hord, 2001; Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987).

What happens to the processes of change as power enters the space of institutionalization?

Implications of this study on the institutionalization of changes in a mentoring program suggest that change is more than processes that link desire and attainment. It is the continual rubbing and irritation of need, process, purpose, attainment, and impact. It suggests that considering acts of power and relationships of power would give dimensionality to the institutionalization of change. Through power, the processes of change as surface structures driven by need and desire are linked vertically to concepts of agency as both possibility and probability and potentiality.

Further study is needed about the way power is immanent in the six principles of change as outlined by the work of Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, and Hall (1987) and further explicated by Hall and Hord (2001). Specifically, it might be asked: What would

be the impact on the formations of power as acts of power and relationships of power by using the processes of implementing change as elaborated by the work of Hall and Hord (2001)?

How do school district leaders recognize and respond to the wonderings and uncertainties of participants as operative agency in an institutionalization project?

This is not simply a matter of listening more or better or longer or more frequently. It is a matter of learning more about the nature of language in institutionalization. It is a matter of exploring the connections between language and the procedures of handling wonder, uncertainty, questions, and doubt as a new program or program changes are established.

A second implication from the present study is that language is key to recognizing and responding to the inevitable wonderings, uncertainties, doubts, and questions that accompany the institutionalization process. It is key to recognizing how the answers to the language of wonder interpellate power both in the sense of calling it forth and asking it to account for itself. Further studies using critical discourse analysis may add knowledge that will eventually enable school people to listen more than monaurally.

For example, a study could hypothesize that if institutionalization of the changes in the mentoring program is carried out by subscribing to a procedural model of change such as the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) (Hall & Hord, 2001; Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987), the language of analysis colonizes the language of wonder by translating uncertainty and doubt into concerns. This suggests unexplored connections and unanswered questions about the use of language in the expression of

wonder, uncertainty, and doubts as concerns particularly in the institutionalization of programs such as new teacher mentoring programs.

What happens to mentoring programs that encompass descriptions of institutionalization phases, procedures, and the workings of power in the space of institutionalization?

A third implication of this present study is that criticality calls attention to looping feedback surveillance that perpetuates objectification and plurality in the mentoring program and names its source as non-consciousness. Without objectification and plurality in the mentoring program, the focus of the role of the mentors changes. Instead of focusing on socialization and the reproduction of technical teaching skills, mentors can analyze their actions, but the analysis will be grounded in the moral question of what is right treatment of others; what actions will leave open the possibility of other actions for others in the program and the new teachers.

This calls for the development of a critical theory of mentoring. A proposed critical theory of mentoring would loosely follow what Schwandt (2001) outlines. A critical theory of mentoring would question, interrogate, reconsider, and provoke the assumptions of mentoring as a social practice. A critical theory of mentoring would consider praxis as the intertextual playfulness of *techne* and *phronesis*. Intertextual as *techne* as craft-knowledge engages *phronesis* as “practical-moral knowledge” (p. 207) in a give and take movement toward praxis as doing the right thing in relationship with others. A critical theory of mentoring would critique from within. Mentoring does not stand apart from its theory; it is partially constructed through itself.

REFERENCES

- American Federation of Teachers. (September 2001). Beginning teacher induction: The essential bridge. *Educational Issues Policy Brief*, 13, 1-13. Retrieved May 1, 2007 from <http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/downloads/teachers/policy13.pdf>.
- American Heritage Dictionary* (Second College Edition) (1985). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Anderson, E. M., & Shannon, A. L. (1995). Toward a conceptualization of mentoring. In T. Kerry, & A. S. Mayes (Eds.), *Issues in mentoring* (pp. 25-34). London: Routledge.
- Apple, M.W. (1982). *Education and power*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Argyris, C. (1990). *Overcoming organizational defenses: Facilitating organizational learning*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Arredondo, D.E., & Rucinski, T. T. (1998). *Using structured interactions in conferences and journals to promote cognitive development among mentors and mentees*. Retrieved June 1, 2003 from <http://80-vnweb.wilsonweb.com.ezproxy.tamu.edu>.
- Baltimore County Public Schools (n.d.). *Baltimore country public schools mentor program*. Retrieved June 15, 2005, from http://bcps.org/offices/pdc/teacher_mentor_trainer.html.
- Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1978). *Federal programs supporting educational change: Implementing and sustaining innovations* (Vol. 8). Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

- Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bowers, C. A. (1984). *The promise of theory*. New York: Longman, Inc.
- Bullough, R. V., Jr. (2005). Being and becoming a mentor: School-based teacher educators and teacher educator identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 143-155.
- Colley, H. (2002). A 'rough guide' to a history of mentoring from a Marxist feminist perspective. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 28, 257-273.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Daloz, L. (1999). *Mentor: Guiding the journey of adult learners*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Edwards, A., & Protheroe, L. (2004). Teaching by proxy: understanding how mentors are positioned in partnerships. *Oxford Review of Education*, 30, 183-197.
- Elliott, B., & Calderhead, J. (1995). Mentoring for teacher development: possibilities and caveats. In T. Kerry, & A. S. Mayes (Eds.), *Issues in mentoring* (pp. 35-58). London: Routledge.
- Ehrich, L. C., Hansford, B., & Tennent, L. (2004). Formal mentoring programs in education and other professions: a review of the literature. *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, 40, 518-540.
- Ellsworth, E. (1994). Why doesn't this feel empowering? In L. Stone (Ed.), *The education feminist reader*, (pp. 300-327). New York: Routledge.

- Ellsworth, E. (2005). *Places of learning: Media, architecture, pedagogy*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Ellsworth, E., & Miller, J. L. (1996). Working difference in education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 26, 245-263.
- Fairclough, N. (2001a). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Fairclough, N. (2001b). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, (pp. 121-138). London: Sage Publications.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Parker, M. B. (1992). *Mentoring in context: A comparison of two U.S. programs for beginning teachers*. Retrieved May 1, 2007 from <http://ncrtl.msu.edu/about.htm>.
- Foucault, M. (1994). *The essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984* (R. Hurley & Others, Trans.). New York: The New York Press. (Original work published 1954-1984).
- Fuller, F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American Educational Research Journal*, 6(2), pp. 207-226.
- Gee, J.P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York: Routledge.

- Giroux, H. A. (2003). Public pedagogy and the politics of resistance: Notes on a critical theory of educational struggle. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 35, 5-16.
- Glorfeld, L. E., Kakonis, T. E., & Wilcox, J. C. (Eds.). *Language, rhetoric and idea*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc.
- Goodall, H. L., Jr. (2000). *Writing the new ethnography*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (2001). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). London: Hodder Arnold.
- Haraway, D. J. (1997)
Modest_witness@second_millennium.femaleman©_meets_oncomouse™. New York: Routledge.
- Haraway, D. (2004). *The Haraway reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Hord, S.M., Rutherford, W.L., Huling-Austin, L., & Hall, G. E. (1987). *Taking charge of change*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2001). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

- Hughes, R. E., & Duhamel, P. A. (1967). Description. In L. E. Glorfeld, T. E. Kakonis, & J. C. Wilcox (Eds.). *Language, rhetoric and idea* (pp. 237-253). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc.
- Ingersoll, R., & Kralik, J. M. (2004). *The impact of mentoring on teacher retention: What the research says*. Retrieved May 1, 2007 from www.ecs.org.
- Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self: Problem and process in human development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (1994). *Developing reflective judgment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Kristeva, J. (1986). Semiotics: A critical science and/or a critique of science. In Moi, T. (Ed.), *The Kristeva reader* (pp. 74-88). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Labouvie-Vief, G. (1994) *Psyche & Eros: Mind and gender in the life course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Macey, D. (2000). *The penguin dictionary of critical theory*. London: Penguin Books.
- Marsh, M. M. (2002). The influence of discourses on the precarious nature of mentoring. *Reflective Practice*, 2, 103-115.
- Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables for the virtual: Movement, affect, sensation*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- McLaren, P. L. (1991). Schooling the postmodern body: Critical pedagogy and the politics of enfleshment. In H. A. Giroux, (Ed.), *Postmodernism, feminism, and*

- cultural politics: Redrawing educational boundaries* (pp. 144-173). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- McLaren, P. (1995). *Critical pedagogy and predatory culture: Oppositional politics in a postmodern era*. London: Routledge.
- Merriam, S. B., & Associates (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method, and politics: Positioning of the approaches to CDA. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 14-31). London: Sage Publications.
- Mills, S. (2004). *Discourse* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Miller, J. L. (2005). *Sounds of silence breaking: Women, autobiography, curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Moi, T. (Ed.). (1986). *The Kristeva reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Murray, M. (2001). *Beyond the myths and magic of mentoring: How to facilitate an effective mentoring process*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- New Teacher Center (January 30, 2005). *An inside view of the Santa Cruz induction model*. Santa Cruz: University of California.
- Norman, P. J., & Feiman-Nemser, S. (2005). Mind activity in teaching and mentoring. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 679-697.
- Odell, S. J., & Huling, L. (2000). *Quality mentoring for novice teachers*. Washington, DC: Association of Teacher Educators & Indianapolis, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

- Perry, W. G., Jr. (1999). *Forms of ethical and intellectual development in the college years: A scheme*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (2004). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Popkewitz, T. E., Tabachnick, B. R., & Wehlage, G. (1982). *The myth of educational reform*. Madison WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Popkewitz, T. S., & Brennan, M. (1998). Restructuring of social and political theory in education: Foucault and a social epistemology of school practices. In Popkewitz, T. S., & Brennan, M. (Eds.), *Foucault's challenge: discourse, knowledge, and power in education* (pp. 3-35). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Reiman, A. J., & Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1998). *Mentoring and supervision for teacher development*. New York: Longman.
- Roberts, A. (2000). Mentoring revisited: A phenomenological reading of the literature. *Mentoring & Tutoring*, 9, 145-170.
- Rockas, L. (1967). Definition. In L. E. Glorfeld, T. E. Kakonis, & J. C. Wilcox (Eds.), *Language, rhetoric and idea* (pp. 268-277). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc.
- Sawicki, J. (1991). *Disciplining Foucault: Feminism, power, and the body*. New York: Routledge.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sim, S. & Van Loon, B. (2001). *Introducing critical theory*. Duxford, Cambridge, UK: Icon Books, Ltd.
- Smith, A.M. (1998). *Laclau and Mouffe: The radical democratic imaginary*. London: Routledge.
- Stake, R. E. (1994). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 236-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Star, S. L. (1991). Power, technologies and the phenomenology of conventions: On being allergic to onions. In J. Law (Ed.), *A sociology of monsters: essays on power, technology and domination* (pp 26-56). London: Routledge.
- Texas State Board for Educator Certification (2005). *Texas beginning educator support system: TxBESS framework*. Austin, TX: Texas State Board for Educator Certification. Retrieved March 2, 2005 from <http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/SBECOnline/txbess/framework.pdf>.
- Thornborrow, J. (2002). *Power talk: Language and interaction in institutional discourse*. Harlow, England: Longman.
- Tierney, W. G. (1998). Life history's history: Subjects foretold. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 4, 49-70.
- Udelhofen, S., & Larson, K. (2003). *The mentoring year: A step-by-step program for professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education (2005). *The secretary's fourth annual report on teacher quality: A highly qualified teacher in every classroom*. Retrieved May 1, 2007 from <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/teachprep/2005Title2-Report.pdf>.
- Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wheatley, M. (1999). *Leadership and the new science: Discovering order in a chaotic world* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is all about – a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1-13). London: Sage Publications.
- Zachary, L. J. (2000). *The mentor's guide: Facilitating effective learning relationships*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

VITA

Phyllis Cavanaugh Ferguson
Educational Administration & Human Resource Development Dept.
511 Harrington Tower
4226 TAMU
College Station, TX 77843-4226

Educational Background

Bachelor of Arts
Elementary Education – 1971
Louisiana State University at New Orleans (now University of New Orleans)

Master of Education, Curriculum and Instruction – 1979
University of New Orleans

Mid-management Certification – 1991
East Texas State University (now Texas A&M at Commerce)

Teaching Certification

State of Louisiana: First – Eighth grades; Reading

State of Texas: First – Eight grades; Reading; Mid-management

Professional Experience

Teacher in Louisiana Public Schools 1971 – 1982

Editor for textbook company 1982 – 1984

Teacher in Texas Public Schools 1985 – 1991

Administrator in Texas Public Schools 1991 – 2005

Profession Presentations

Texas Elementary and Supervisor Association - 1997; Curriculum and Pedagogy
Conference – 2006